



CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

1993

NCAA

CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

National Collegiate Athletic Association



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

6201 College Boulevard
Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422
913/339-1906
April 1993

Edited By: Michael V. Earle, *Director of Publishing.*

Distributed to chief executive officers, conference commissioners, affiliated and corresponding members.

NCAA, NCAA seal, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

Table of Contents

I. Register 1993	7
Administrative Organization	26
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Media	26
II. Proceedings at the 87th NCAA Convention	
Opening Business Session	55
Opening Remarks	55
Convention Committees	56
Report of Council	56
Report of NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force	59
Report of Memorial Resolutions Committee	62
State of the Association Address	64
Division I-A Business Session	74
Opening Remarks	74
Proposed Amendments	74
Recruiting — Telephone Calls (No. 117)	74
Contacts — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (No. 118)	77
Evaluations — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (No. 130)	81
Division I-AA Business Session	82
Opening Remarks	82
Proposed Amendments	82
Restricted-Earnings Coaches — Division I-AA (No. 62)	82
Division I-AA Coaching Limitations — Contact and Evaluation of Prospects Off Campus (No. 63)	84
One-Time Transfer Exception — Division I-AA (No. 78)	84
Resolution: Division I-AA Football Scholarship Limits (No. 88)	85
Contest Exemptions — Division I-AA Football (No. 105)	85
Evaluations — Division I-AA Football (No. 122)	86
Evaluations — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (No. 130)	86
Division I-AA Scheduling Requirements (No. 133)	87
Recruiting — Telephone Calls (No. 117)	87
Discussion	88
Proposed Amendment	90
Contacts — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football (No. 118)	90
Closing Remarks	90
Division I-AAA Business Session	92
Opening Remarks	92
Review of Proposed Amendments	92
Discussion	92
Division II Business Session	94
Opening Remarks	94
Review of Proposed Amendments	94
Waivers	95
Proposed Amendments	96
Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse (No. 17)	96
Initial Eligibility — Core Curriculum Requirements (No. 19)	104
Initial Eligibility — Core Curriculum Requirements (No. 20)	104
On-Court Basketball Practice — Divisions II and III (No. 40)	105
Distribution of Graduation-Rate Report (No. 18)	107
Nominating Committee	109
Continuation of Division II Business Session	109
Proposed Amendments	109
Professional Enhancement Programs (No. 66)	109
Coaches — Endorsement of Noninstitutional Publications (No. 67)	110
Coaches — Scouting-Service Consultant (No. 68)	110
Initial Eligibility — Change in Sport Classification (No. 71)	110
Initial Eligibility — Test-Score Requirement (No. 69)	111
Individual Eligibility — Change in Sport Classification (No. 73)	112
Individual Eligibility — Graduate Student (No. 77)	113
Transfer Eligibility — Division II (No. 79)	113
Outside Competition — Division II (No. 81)	114

Employment Earnings — Division II (No. 84).....	115
Honorary Academic Awards — Division II (No. 89).....	117
Financial Aid — Division II Men's Lacrosse (No. 90).....	117
Maximum Awards — Division II (No. 91).....	118
Playing and Practice Seasons (No. 96).....	119
Conference Exception — Division II Basketball (No. 102).....	119
First Contest Date — Cross Country, Field Hockey and Water Polo (No. 103).....	120
Maximum Dates of Competition — Divisions I and II Cross Country (No. 104).....	120
Spring Football — Division II (No. 106).....	120
Golf Practice Round — Time Limits (No. 107).....	121
Maximum Dates of Competition — Gymnastics (No. 109).....	121
Maximum Dates of Competition — Skiing (No. 111).....	122
Preseason Soccer Scrimmages — Division II (No. 112).....	122
Women's Volleyball — Preseason Alumni Match (No. 114).....	122
Local Sports Clubs (No. 115).....	122
Recruiting — Telephone Calls (No. 116).....	123
Recruiting — Contacts (No. 119).....	123
Evaluations — Division II Women's Basketball (No. 128).....	123
Women's Basketball Scheduling Requirements — Division II (No. 138).....	123
Official Visit — Academic Transcript (No. 125).....	124
Report.....	124
Championships Committee.....	124
Panel Discussion.....	127
Open Discussion.....	133
Reconsideration of Voting Action.....	147
Reconsideration of Local Sports Clubs (No. 115).....	147
Closing Remarks.....	148
Division III Business Session.....	149
Opening Remarks.....	149
Reports of Committees.....	149
Steering Committee.....	149
Presidents Commission.....	150
Championships Committee.....	153
Proposed Amendments.....	154
Division III Playing and Practice Seasons (No. 38).....	154
Division III Preseason Practice Opportunities — Traditional Segment (No. 39).....	157
On-Court Basketball Practice — Divisions II and III (No. 40).....	158
Division III Playing and Practice Seasons — Nontraditional Segment (No. 41).....	159
Playing and Practice Seasons — Division III Women's Golf (No. 42).....	159
Division III Playing and Practice Seasons — Dividing Segments (No. 43).....	161
Contest Exemptions — Division III Basketball (No. 44).....	162
Contest Exemptions — Division III Basketball (No. 45).....	162
Division III Playing and Practice Seasons (No. 46).....	163
Maximum Dates of Competition — Division III Cross Country (No. 47).....	164
Maximum Number of Contests — Division III Football (No. 48).....	165
Preseason Football Scrimmage — Division III (No. 49).....	166
Review of Proposed Amendments.....	167
Gender-Equity Discussion.....	171
Continuation of Division III Business Session.....	175
Opening Remarks.....	175
Reports of Committees.....	175
Executive Committee.....	175
Special Committee to Review the NCAA Division III Institutional Self-Study Guide.....	178
Waivers.....	178
Nominating Committee.....	178
Proposed Amendments.....	178
Professional Enhancement Programs (No. 66).....	178

Individual Eligibility — Graduate Student (No. 17).....	179
Academic Honor Awards — Division III (No. 92).....	180
Nonathletics Achievement Awards (No. 93).....	182
Playing and Practice Seasons (No. 96).....	182
First Contest Date — Cross Country, Field Hockey and Water Polo (No. 103).....	182
Resolution: Division III Men's and Women's Soccer (No. 155).....	183
Discussion.....	183
Continuation of Division III Business Session.....	190
Discussion.....	190
Closing Remarks.....	204
Division I Business Session.....	206
Opening Remarks.....	206
Proposed Amendments.....	206
NCAA Athletics Certification Program (No. 15).....	211
Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse (No. 17).....	211
Initial Eligibility — Core-Curriculum Requirements (No. 19).....	213
Distribution of Graduation-Rate Report (No. 18).....	219
Initial Eligibility — Core-Curriculum Requirements (No. 20).....	221
Graduate Assistant Coach (No. 22).....	221
Expenses — Volunteer Coach — Baseball (No. 23).....	222
Coaching Limitations — Men's Basketball (No. 25).....	223
Maximum Awards — Division I Women's Equivalency Sports (No. 27).....	228
Maximum Awards — Division I Women's Basketball (No. 28).....	228
Maximum Awards — Division I Men's Basketball (No. 30).....	228
Financial Aid Limitations — Men's Ice Hockey (No. 31).....	231
Playing and Practice Seasons — Division I Baseball (No. 34).....	233
Continuation of Division I Business Session.....	234
Opening Remarks.....	234
Proposed Amendments.....	234
Coaching Limitations — Division I (No. 61).....	234
Recruiting — Division I Basketball (No. 64).....	234
Coaching Limitations (No. 65).....	236
Professional Enhancement Camps (No. 66).....	236
Coaches — Endorsement of Noninstitutional Publications (No. 67).....	237
Coaches — Scouting-Service Consultant (No. 68).....	237
Initial Eligibility — Test-Score Requirement (No. 69).....	238
Seasons of Competition — Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier (No. 70).....	240
Initial Eligibility — Change in Sport Classification (No. 71).....	244
Individual Eligibility — Change in Sport Classification (No. 72).....	244
Individual Eligibility (No. 76).....	245
Individual Eligibility — Graduate Student (No. 77).....	245
Financial Aid — Individual Limitation (No. 83).....	246
Financial Aid — Pell Grant (No. 87).....	246
Summer Competition — Individual Sports (No. 95).....	248
Playing and Practice Seasons (No. 96).....	248
First Contest Date — Division I Basketball (No. 98).....	249
First Contest Date Exception — Division I Basketball (No. 99).....	249
Contest Exemptions — Division I Basketball (No. 101).....	250
First Contest Date — Cross Country, Field Hockey and Water Polo (No. 103).....	251
Maximum Dates of Competition — Divisions I and II Cross Country (No. 104).....	251
Golf Practice Round — Time Limits (No. 107).....	251
Golf — College-Am Tournaments (No. 108).....	253
Continuation of Division I Business Session.....	254
Proposed Amendments.....	254
Contest Exemptions — Division I Ice Hockey (No. 110).....	254
Dates of Competition — Indoor and Outdoor Track (No. 113).....	255
Women's Volleyball — Preseason Alumni Match (No. 114).....	257
Local Sports Clubs (No. 115).....	257
Recruiting — Telephone Calls (No. 116).....	258
Recruiting — Contacts (No. 119).....	258
Institutional Stationery (No. 123).....	258

Official Visit — Academic Transcript (No. 125).....	259
Official Visit Prior to Early Signing Period (No. 126).....	259
Summer Basketball Camp Certification — Division I (No. 127).....	260
Division I Membership Requirements — Financial Aid (No. 135).....	261
Sports Sponsorship — Division I (No. 136).....	262
Sports Sponsorship — Indoor and Outdoor Track (No. 137).....	263
Athletics Housing (No. 143).....	263
Division I Championships Eligibility (No. 154).....	264
Nominating Committee.....	265
NCAA Honors Dinner.....	266
General Business Session.....	284
Opening Remarks.....	284
Reconsideration of Division Voting Action.....	284
Reconsideration of Maximum Awards — Division I Men's Basketball (No. 30).....	284
Reconsideration of Distribution of Graduation-Rate Report (No. 18).....	285
Proposed Amendments.....	285
NCAA Athletics Certification Program (No. 15).....	285
Joint Policy Board (No. 50).....	286
Proposed Legislation — Committee Review and Amendment Limitation (No. 51).....	286
Revised Legislative Calendar (No. 52).....	291
Administrative Review Panel (No. 53).....	291
Committee on Infractions (No. 54).....	292
Infractions Appeals Committee (No. 55).....	293
Resolution: Disclosure of Graduation Rates (No. 56).....	294
Resolution: Financial Issues (No. 57).....	295
Resolution: The Student-Athlete: Welfare, Access and Equity (No. 58).....	295
Discussion.....	296
Continuation of General Business Session.....	302
Supplement to Memorial Resolutions Committee Report.....	302
Opening Remarks.....	303
Proposed Amendments.....	303
Reconsideration of Voting Action.....	303
Reconsideration of Golf — College-Am Tournaments (No. 108).....	303
Reconsideration of Seasons of Competition — Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier (No. 70).....	304
Proposed Amendments.....	305
Individual Eligibility — Drug Testing (No. 74).....	305
Eligibility — Season-of-Competition Waiver (No. 75).....	306
One-Time Transfer Exception — Division I-AA (No. 78).....	307
On-Campus Employment (No. 82).....	309
Financial Aid — Gradation or Cancellation (No. 86).....	310
Unclassified Football — Division I (No. 131).....	311
Membership — Two-Season Requirement (No. 134).....	314
Developmental Training Expenses (No. 139).....	314
Medical Examinations (No. 140).....	315
Media Guides (No. 141).....	316
Travel Expenses — Exception (No. 148).....	316
Principle of Nondiscrimination (No. 149).....	316
NCAA Staff Interpretations (No. 150).....	317
Resolution: Federation by Sport (No. 151).....	319
Championship Criteria — Minimum Sponsorship Exception (No. 152).....	321
Basketball Officiating Committee (No. 156).....	322
Special Events Committee (No. 158).....	322
Closing Remarks.....	323
III. Appendices	
A. Legislative Proposals.....	A- 1
B. Roll-Call Voting.....	A-168
C. Convention Committees.....	A-190
D. Past Convention Sites.....	A-192
E. NCAA Officers, 1906-1993.....	A-194

Administrative Organization

NCAA Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee includes the NCAA officers (president, secretary-treasurer, division vice-presidents) and the NCAA executive director.

President

JUDITH M. SWEET
Director of Athletics
University of California, San Diego
LaJolla, California 92093-0905
(Term Expires January 1993*)

Secretary-Treasurer

B. J. SKELTON
Vice-Provost, Dean, Admissions and Registration
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina 29634-5126
(Term Expires January 1993*)

Executive Director

RICHARD D. SCHULTZ
6201 College Boulevard
Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422

Division I Vice-President: R. Elaine Dreidame, University of Dayton
(Term Expires January 1994*)

Division II Vice-President: Anthony F. Ceddia, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania (Term Expires January 1993*)

Division III Vice-President: John H. Harvey, Carnegie Mellon University
(Term Expires January 1994*)

NCAA Staff Liaison:
Ted C. Tow

NCAA Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chair and secretary, respectively. The other 44 members of the Council shall include 22 members from Division I (including at least two chief executive officers and at least six women), 11 members from Division II (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women), and 11 members from Division III (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women). The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the membership of that division present and voting at the division business session during the annual Convention. [Constitution 4.1.]

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Administrative Organization

Division I

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Warner Alford Director of Athletics University of Mississippi University, Mississippi 38677	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
Robert A. Alost President Northwestern State University Natchitoches, Louisiana 71497	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1996*
Thurston E. Banks Associate Professor of Chemistry Tennessee Technological University Cookeville, Tennessee 38505	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan 1993*
Charles Cavagnaro Director of Athletics Memphis State University Memphis, Tennessee 38152	I-A Independent South (Region 2)	Jan 1994*
Irwin M. Cohen Director of Athletics Northeastern University Boston, Massachusetts 02115	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan 1994*
Kay Don Associate Director of Athletics California State University Long Beach, California 90840-0118	I-A Big West Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1995*
R. Elaine Dreidame Senior Associate Director of Athletics University of Dayton Dayton, Ohio 45469-1220	I-AAA (Region 3)	Jan 1994*
Daniel G. Gibbens Professor of Law University of Oklahoma Norman, Oklahoma 73019	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1994*
Michael L. Kasavana Professor, Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Management Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan 48824	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1993*
David B. Keilitz Director of Athletics Central Michigan University Mount Pleasant, Michigan 48859	I-A Mid-American Athletic Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1993*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Jerry L. Kingston Professor of Economics Arizona State University Tucson, Arizona 85287-2505	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1996*
Jim G. Malik Professor of Chemistry San Diego State University San Diego, California 92182-0328	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1994*
Chris Monasch Commissioner Northeast Conference 900 Route 9 Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
Richard A. Rosenthal Director of Athletics University of Notre Dame Notre Dame, Indiana 46556	I-A Independent North (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
William M. Sangster Director, Office of International Programs Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0590	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1996*
Doris R. Soladay Associate Director of Athletics Syracuse University Syracuse, New York 13244-5020	I-A Big East Conference (Region 1)	Jan. 1995*
Patricia V. Viverito Commissioner, Gateway Football Conference or, Senior Associate Commissioner, Missouri Valley Conference 100 North Broadway, Suite 1135 St. Louis, Missouri 63102	I-At Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1995*
Shirley A. Walker Coordinator of Women's Sports/ Head Women's Basketball Coach Alcorn State University Lorman, Mississippi 39096	I-At Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1995*
Mary Jo Warner Senior Associate Director of Athletics George Washington University Washington, D.C. 20052	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
Lt. Gen. Claudius E. Watts III President The Citadel Charleston, South Carolina 29409	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1993

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Frank Windegger Director of Athletics Texas Christian University Fort Worth, Texas 76129	I-A Southwest Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1993*
W. Wayne Wright Director of Athletics Pepperdine University Malibu, California 90263	I-AAA (Region 4)	Jan. 1994*

Division II

Name, Institution	Term Expires
Ollie Bowman Dean of Admissions Hampton University Hampton, Virginia 23668 (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*
Clint Bryant Director of Athletics Augusta College Augusta, Georgia 30910 (Region 2)	Jan. 1993
Rita M. Castagna Director of Athletics Assumption College Worcester, Massachusetts 01615-0005 (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
Anthony F. Ceddia President Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania Shippensburg, Pennsylvania 17257 (Region 1)	Jan. 1993*
Dorothy E. Dreyer Assistant Professor of Speech Wayne State University Detroit, Michigan 48202 (Region 3)	Jan. 1994*
James Fallis Director of Athletics Lake Superior State University Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan 49783 (Region 3)	Jan. 1993*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Name, Institution	Term Expires
Richard A. Johannningmeier Director of Athletics Washburn University Topeka, Kansas 66621 (Region 4)	Jan. 1996*
Janet R. Kittell Director of Athletics California State University Chico, California 95929-0300 (Region 4)	Jan. 1996*
Charles N. "Chuck" Lindemann Director of Athletics Humboldt State University Arcata, California 95521 (Region 4)	Jan. 1995*
Harold J. McGee President Jacksonville State University Jacksonville, Alabama 36265 (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
Douglas T. Porter Director of Athletics Fort Valley State College Fort Valley, Georgia 31030 (Region 2)	Jan. 1993*

Division III

Name, Institution	Term Expires
Dolores A. Bogard Associate Director of Athletics State University College Cortland, New York 13045 (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
Robert G. Bottoms President DePauw University Greencastle, Indiana 46135 (Region 3)	Jan. 1995*
Dennis M. Collins Executive Director North Coast Conference P.O. Box 16679 Cleveland, Ohio 44116-0679 (Region 3)	Jan. 1993

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Name, Institution

Term Expires

Arthur Eason

Jan. 1993*

Director of Athletics
William Paterson College
Wayne, New Jersey 07470
(Region 1)

Marjorie B. Giles

Jan. 1994*

Dean of Students
Central College
Pella, Iowa 50219
(Region 4)

George M. Harmon

Jan. 1993*

President
Millsaps College
Jackson, Mississippi 39210
(Region 3)

John H. Harvey

Jan. 1995*

Director of Athletics
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
(Region 2)

David A. Jacobs

Jan. 1993*

Director of Athletics
Whittier College
Whittier, California 90608
(Region 4)

William E. Lide

Jan. 1994*

Director of Athletics
Salisbury State University
Salisbury, Maryland 21801
(Region 1)

Linda S. Moulton

Jan. 1996*

Director of Athletics
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts 01610-1477
(Region 1)

Sandra R. Weeden

Jan. 1994*

Associate Professor of Education/
Director of Women's Athletics
State University of New York
Stony Brook, New York 11794-3500
(Region 2)

NCAA Staff Liaison:

Richard D. Schultz (Executive Director)

Ted C. Tow (Council, Division I)

Carol P. Powell (Division II)

Daniel T. Dutcher (Division III)

Nancy L. Mitchell (Legislation and Interpretations)
Stephen R. Morgan (Legislation and Interpretations)
John H. Leavens (Recording Secretary)
Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

NCAA Executive Committee

The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are *ex officio* members of the Executive Committee. The division vice-presidents shall be members, and the remaining nine members are elected by the Council for terms of five years. [Constitution 4.2.]

Division	Name, Institution	Term Expires
III	Mary R. Barrett Associate Director of Athletics University of Massachusetts Boston, Massachusetts 02125	Jan. 1996*
I-AA	Charles S. Boone Director of Athletics University of Richmond Richmond, Virginia 23173	Jan. 1995*
II VP	Anthony F. Ceddia President Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania Shippensburg, Pennsylvania 17257	Jan. 1993*
I-A	Eugene F. Corrigan Commissioner Atlantic Coast Conference P. O. Drawer ACC Greensboro, North Carolina 27419-6999	Jan. 1993*
I-A	Joan C. Cronan Director of Women's Athletics University of Tennessee Knoxville, Tennessee 37996	Jan. 1997*
I-A	Cedric W. Dempsey Director of Athletics University of Arizona Tucson, Arizona 85721	Jan. 1995*
I-AAA	Don J. DiJulia Assistant Vice-President and Director of Athletics St. Joseph's University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131	Jan. 1995*
I VP (I-AAA)	R. Elaine Dreidame Senior Associate Director of Athletics University of Dayton Dayton, Ohio 45469-1220	Jan. 1994*
I-AA	Kenneth A. Free Commissioner Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference 102 North Elm Street, Suite 401 Greensboro, North Carolina 27401	Jan. 1996*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Division	Name, Institution	Term Expires
III VP	John H. Harvey Director of Athletics Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213	Jan. 1994*
I-A	Phyllis L. Howlett Assistant Commissioner Big Ten Conference 1500 West Higgins Road Park Ridge, Illinois 60068-6300	Jan. 1995*
II	Jerry M. Hughes Director of Athletics Central Missouri State University Warrensburg, Missouri 64093	Jan. 1996*

NCAA Staff Liaison.

Richard D. Schultz (Executive Director)
Patricia E. Bork (Executive Committee, Division I)
Thomas W. Jernstedt (Division I)
Dennis L. Poppe (Division II)
Donna J. Noonan (Division III)
Frank E. Marshall (Business Affairs)
Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Presidents Commission

The Presidents Commission is elected by a mail vote of the chief executive officers of all member institutions (or selected by the Division I-A conferences). The 44 members shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members. At least three women shall be included, preferably one from each division. The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the chief executive officers of that division (or by the Division I-A conferences). The officers of the Presidents Commission are elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the Commission's members to serve for two years.

	Term as Chair Expires
Commission Chair: Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien University of New Orleans	Jan. 1994*
Division I Chair: Charles E. Young University of California, Los Angeles	Jan. 1994*
Division II Chair: Arend D. Lubbers Grand Valley State University	Jan. 1994*
Division III Chair: David L. Warren Ohio Wesleyan University	Jan. 1993*

Division I

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Judith E. N. Albino President University of Colorado System Boulder, Colorado 80309	I-A At Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
Steven C. Beering President Purdue University West Lafayette, Indiana 47907	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
Richard L. Bowen President Idaho State University Pocatello, Idaho 82109	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1996*
Anthony J. DiGiorgio President Winthrop University Rock Hill, South Carolina 29733	I-AAA At Large (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Sheldon Hackney President University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1993*
Thomas K. Hearn Jr. President Wake Forest University Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27109	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*
Eamon Kelly President Tulane University New Orleans, Louisiana 70118	I-A Independent South (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
Samuel H. Magill President Monmouth College West Long Branch, New Jersey 07764	I-AAA At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1994*
James D. McComas President Virginia Polytechnic Institute Blacksburg, Virginia 24061	I-A Independent North (Region 2)	Jan. 1993
Curtis McCray President California State University Long Beach, California 90840-0118	I-A Big West Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1995*
William H. Mobley President Texas A&M University College Station, Texas 77843	I-A Southwest Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1994
Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien Chancellor University of New Orleans New Orleans, Louisiana 70148	I-AAA At Large (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*
Frederick W. Obear Chancellor University of Tennessee Chattanooga, Tennessee 37403	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*
Oscar C. Page President Austin Peay State University Clarksville, Tennessee 37044-4576	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Richard E. Peck President University of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1993
E. Roger Sayers President University of Alabama Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1996*
Brother Thomas J. Scanlan President Manhattan College Riverdale, New York 10471	I-AAA At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
William E. Shelton President Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197	I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1993
William W. Sutton President Mississippi Valley State University Itta Bena, Mississippi 38941	I-AA At Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1993
Stephen Joel Trachtenberg President George Washington University Washington, D.C. 20052	I-AAA At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1993*
Jon Wefald President Kansas State University Manhattan, Kansas 66506	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1995*
Charles E. Young Chancellor University of California Los Angeles, California 90024	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1994*

Division II

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Donald Behrend Chancellor University of Alaska Anchorage, Alaska 99508 (Region 4)	Jan. 1993

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Anthony James Catanese President Florida Atlantic University Boca Raton, Florida 33431 (Region 2)	Jan. 1994*
Thomas W. Cole Jr. President Clark Atlanta University Atlanta, Georgia 30314 (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
Joseph H. Hagan President Assumption College Worcester, Massachusetts 01615-0005 (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
Rodney C. Kelchner President Mansfield University of Pennsylvania Mansfield, Pennsylvania 16933 (Region 1)	Jan. 1994*
Arend D. Lubbers President Grand Valley State University Allendale, Michigan 49401 (Region 3)	Jan. 1994*
Joseph J. McGowan Jr. President Bellarmine College Louisville, Kentucky 40205 (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
Judith A. Ramaley President Portland State University Portland, Oregon 97207 (Region 4)	Jan. 1993
Olin B. Sansbury Jr. Chancellor University of South Carolina Spartanburg, South Carolina 29303 (Region 2)	Jan. 1995*
Bob H. Suzuki President California State Polytechnic University Pomona, California 91768 (Region 4)	Jan. 1995*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Name, Institution
 Kent Wyatt
 President
 Delta State University
 Cleveland, Mississippi 38733
 (Region 3)

Term Expires
 Jan. 1996*

Division III

Name, Institution
 Michael F. Adams
 President
 Centre College
 Danville, Kentucky 40422-1394
 (Region 3)

James R. Appleton
 President
 University of Redlands
 Redlands, California 92373-0999
 (Region 4)

Robert J. Bruce
 President
 Widener University
 Chester, Pennsylvania 19013
 (Region 2)

David G. Carter
 President
 Eastern Connecticut State University
 Willimantic, Connecticut 06226
 (Region 1)

Alice Chandler
 President
 State University College
 New Paltz, New York 12562
 (Region 2)

Claire L. Gaudiani
 President
 Connecticut College
 New London, Connecticut 06320
 (Region 1)

Rev. Michael J. Lavelle
 President
 John Carroll University
 University Heights, Ohio 44118-4581
 (Region 3)

Term Expires
 Jan. 1996*
 Jan. 1995*
 Jan. 1996*
 Jan. 1993
 Jan. 1994*
 Jan. 1996*
 Jan. 1995*

Name, Institution

David Marker
 President
 Cornell College
 Mount Vernon, Iowa 52314
 (Region 4)

Term Expires
 Jan 1993*

Jon C. Strauss
 President
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute
 Worcester, Massachusetts 01609
 (Region 1)

Jan. 1994*

David L. Warren
 President
 Ohio Wesleyan University
 Delaware, Ohio 43015
 (Region 3)

Jan. 1993*

Cordell Wynn
 President
 Stillman College
 Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35403
 (Region 3)

Jan. 1995*

NCAA Staff Liaison:
 Richard D. Schultz (Executive Director)
 Ted C. Tow (Presidents Commission, Division I)
 Carol P. Powell (Division II)
 Daniel T. Dutcher (Division III)
 Nancy L. Mitchell (Legislation and Interpretations)
 Stephen R. Morgan (Legislation and Interpretations)
 John H. Leavens (Recording Secretary)
 Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

NCAA National Office

Management Group

Richard D. Schultz, *Executive Director*
Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Deputy Executive Director/Chief Operating Officer*
Patricia E. Bork, *Group Executive Director for Championships and Event Management*
Francis M. Canavan, *Group Executive Director for Public Affairs*
Frank E. Marshall, *Group Executive Director for Administration and Finance*
Stephen R. Morgan, *Group Executive Director for Membership Services*

Executive Affairs

Louis J. Spry, *Associate Executive Director*
Ted C. Tow, *Associate Executive Director*
John E. Lamb, *Director of Aviation*
Lydia L. Sanchez, *Director of Conventions and Meetings/Assistant to the Executive Director*
Eugene M. Lamb, *Chief of Maintenance (Aviation)*

Administration and Finance Group

Stanley D. Johnson, *Director of Professional Development*
Keith E. Martin, *Director of Accounting*
Michael S. McNeely, *Director of Operations*
Daniel W. Spencer, *Director of Data Processing*
Frank D. Uryasz, *Director of Sports Sciences*
Ursula R. Walsh, *Director of Research*
Susan J. Brown, *Programmer/Analyst*
Douglas A. Carpenter, *Programmer/Analyst*
Kevin G. Clark, *Accountant*
Kathy L. Day, *Programmer/Analyst*
Randall W. Dick, *Assistant Director of Sports Sciences*
William C. Foreman, *Building Manager*
Maria B. Gleason, *Office Services Center Manager*
Ellen Hanley, *Assistant Director of Sports Sciences*
Mary J. Hill, *Programmer/Analyst*
Donna L. Hockersmith, *Administrative Assistant for Sports Sciences*
Suzanne M. Kerley, *Personnel Manager*
Allison Laubenstein, *Programmer/Analyst*
De Ann M. Mortensen, *Assistant Personnel Manager*
Todd A. Petr, *Assistant Director of Research*
Patricia A. Schaefer, *Administrative Assistant for Sports Sciences*
Sarah A. Thomas, *Accountant*
Fannie B. Vaughan, *Executive Assistant*
Danny W. Womack, *Programmer/Analyst*

Championships and Event Management Group

William R. Hancock, *Director of Division I Men's Basketball Championship*
Daniel A. Calandro, *Director of Division I Men's Basketball Operations*
Donna J. Noonan, *Director of Championships*
Dennis L. Poppe, *Director of Championships*
Edward A. Thiebe, *Director of Youth Programs*
R. Wayne Burrow, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Philip A. Buttafuoco, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Sharon K. Cessna, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Rochelle M. Collins, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Thomas A. Jacobs, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Harley W. Lewis, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Bernard M. Muir, *Assistant Director of Division I Men's Basketball Championship*
Deborah R. Nelson, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Christine M. Pohl, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Michelle A. Pond, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Marie T. Tuite, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Membership Services Group

S. David Berst, *Assistant Executive Director for Enforcement*
John H. Leavens, *Assistant Executive Director for Compliance Services*
Nancy L. Mitchell, *Assistant Executive Director for Legislative Services*
Daniel T. Dutcher, *Director of Legislative Services*
Richard R. Hilliard, *Director of Enforcement*
Mark P. Jones, *Director of Enforcement*
Janet M. Justus, *Director of Eligibility*
David A. Knopp, *Director of Compliance Services*
Kevin C. Lennon, *Director of Compliance Services*
Stephen A. Mallonee, *Director of Legislative Services*
Robert J. Minnix, *Director of Enforcement*
Robert A. Oliver, *Director of Legislative Services*
Charles E. Smrt, *Director of Enforcement*
Craig W. Angelos, *Legislative Assistant*
Rebecca G. Bowman, *Compliance Representative*
David R. Brunk, *Compliance Representative*
Robert A. Burton, *Legislative Assistant*
Janet T. Calandro, *Compliance Representative*
Jacqueline Campbell, *Legislative Assistant*
Shepard C. Cooper, *Enforcement Representative*
Melisa A. Dehon, *Enforcement Representative*
Carolyn A. Dias, *Compliance Representative*
Carrie A. Doyle, *Enforcement Representative*
Jeffrey D. Freedman, *Eligibility Representative*
Cynthia J. Gabel, *Enforcement Representative*
Susan E. Glatter, *Eligibility Representative*
Shawna L. Hutchins, *Legislative Assistant*
Charles A. Jones, *Compliance Representative*

Gary F. Karner, *Compliance Representative*
 Valerie Lemoignan, *Legislative Assistant*
 Adrienne R. Lotson, *Enforcement Representative*
 Edward B. Lupomech, *Enforcement Representative*
 Shane Lyons, *Legislative Assistant*
 Michael J. Marcil, *Compliance Representative*
 Arthur J. McAfee, *Enforcement Representative*
 Lori McQueen, *Enforcement Representative*
 Steven D. Nelson, *Enforcement Representative*
 Louis A. Onofrio, *Eligibility Representative*
 Amy L. Perko, *Enforcement Representative*
 Richard C. Perko, *Legislative Assistant*
 Les J. Pico, *Enforcement Representative*
 Carol P. Powell, *Legislative Assistant*
 N. Bea Pray, *Compliance Representative*
 Garnett H. Purnell, *Compliance Representative*
 Marybeth Ruskamp, *Legislative Assistant*
 William S. Saum, *Enforcement Representative*
 Christopher D. Schoemann, *Legislative Assistant*
 Kathryn M. Statz, *Eligibility Representative*
 Dirk L. Taitt, *Enforcement Representative*
 Robert W. Thomas, *Compliance Representative*
 Guy Troupe, *Enforcement Representative*
 Stan Wilcox, *Legislative Assistant*
 Shirley M. Whitacre, *Membership Coordinator*
 Athena Yiamouyiannis, *Legislative Assistant*

Public Affairs Group

David E. Cawood, *Assistant Executive Director for Communications*
 Wallace I. Renfro, *Assistant Executive Director for Publishing*
 Robert E. Sprenger, *Assistant Executive Director for Visitors Center
 and Special Projects*

Michael V. Earle, *Director of Publishing*
 James A. Marchiony, *Director of Communications*
 P. David Pickle, *Editor-in-Chief, The NCAA News*
 Victor M. Royal, *Director of Graphics*
 Will J. Rudd, *Director of the Visitors Center*
 John T. Waters, *Director of Licensing*
 Alfred B. White, *Director of Promotions*
 Maxine R. Alejos, *Circulation Manager*
 Martin T. Benson, *Publications Editor*
 Laura E. Bollig, *Publications Editor*
 Theodore A. Breidenthal, *Publications Editor*
 Gary T. Brown, *Publications Editor*
 Richard M. Campbell, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*
 Jack L. Copeland, *Managing Editor, The NCAA News*
 Leslie E. Drew, *Technical Director*
 Steven R. Hagwell, *Publications Editor*

Kathryn P. Hill, *Merchandise Manager*
 Jeffrey S. Hiller, *Assistant Director of the Visitors Center*
 Kerwin E. Hudson, *Assistant Director of Communications*
 Gary K. Johnson, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*
 Regina L. McNeal, *Assistant Director of Communications*
 Ronald D. Mott, *Editorial and Advertising Assistant, The NCAA News*
 Lee Newman, *Publishing Production Manager*
 John D. Painter, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*
 Ronald Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service, 119 West 57th Street,
 Suite 1212, New York, N.Y. 10019*
 Sean W. Straziscar, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*
 J. Gregory Summers, *Assistant Director of Publishing*
 Cynthia M. Van Matre, *Assistant Director of Promotions*
 James M. Van Valkenburg, *Director of Statistics*
 Vikki K. Watson, *Assistant Editor, The NCAA News*
 James F. Wright, *Assistant Director of Communications*

87th Annual Convention

Delegates and Visitors

Active Member Institutions

Abilene Christian University: Cecil Eager, David B. Merrell, Royce Money
 Adams State College: Vivian Frausto
 Adelphi University: Michael Givant, Robert E. Hartwell
 Akron, University of: James Dennison, Robert Fournier, David Jamison, Dawn Moore, Marion A. Ruebel
 Alabama, University of, at Birmingham: Joe Davidson, Virginia D. Gauld, Charles A. McCallum, J. Dudley Pewitt, Calli Theisen Sanders
 Alabama, University of, Huntsville: Paul H. Brand
 Alabama, University of, Tuscaloosa: Thomas L. Jones, E. Roger Sayers, Gary M. White
 Alabama A&M University: Betty Kelly Austin, David B. Henson, Charman J. Humphrey
 Alabama State University: Arthur D. Barnett, Wallace Maryland Jr.
 Alaska Anchorage, University of: Donald F. Behrend, Timothy Dillon, Tim McDiffett, W. Jack Peterson
 Alaska Fairbanks, University of: Ed S. Cridge, G. Lynn Lashbrook, Karen J. Morris
 Albany, State University of New York at: William M. Moore
 Albany State College (Georgia): Billy C. Black, Wilburn A. Campbell Jr., Shirley Reese
 Albion College: Frank Joranko
 Alcorn State University: Cardell Jones, Shirley A. Walker
 Alfred University: Edward G. Coll Jr., Henry Ford
 Allegheny College: Richard A. Creehan, Maureen Hunter Hager
 Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales: Dennis A. Booher
 Alma College: Debra Mapes
 American International College: Robert E. Burke
 American University: Joseph F. O'Donnell, Barbara J. Reimann
 American University of Puerto Rico: Eddie Gonzalez
 Amherst College: Susan M. Zawacki
 Anderson University: James L. Edwards, Cynthia Peck
 Angelo State University: Kathleen Brasfield, Ollie S. Cauthen, Jerry Vandergriff, Lloyd D. Vincent
 Anna Maria College: Stephen C. Washkevich
 Appalachian State University: Judith Clarke, Alan J. Hauser, Roachel Laney, John E. Thomas
 Arizona, University of: Cedric W. Dempsey, Kathleen L. LaRose, Manuel T. Pacheco
 Arizona State University: Herman R. Frazier, Charles S. Harris, Jerry L. Kingston, John R. Park

Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: Randy Cale, Daniel E. Ferritor, Beverly D. Rouse Lewis, Terry Don Phillips, Albert M. Witte
 Arkansas, University of, Little Rock: Mike Hamrick, Gary A. Heidt, Richard Turner, Bill Walker
 Arkansas State University: Sam R. Gennuso, John N. Mangieri, Charles J. Thornton
 Armstrong State College: John G. Brewer, Roger L. Council
 Ashland College: Murray Hudson, Alan R. Platt, Robert L. Wendling
 Assumption College: Rita M. Castagna, Joseph H. Hagan
 Auburn University: Barbara L. Camp, Milo R. Lude, Jane B. Moore, William V. Muse
 Augusta College: Clint Bryant, Martha K. Farmer, Mary Lisko
 Augustana College (Illinois): John R. Farwell, Bruce R. McCart
 Augustana College (South Dakota): Bill Gross, Mel Klein
 Aurora University: Sam S. Bedrosian
 Austin Peay State University: Oscar C. Page, Tim L. Weiser
 Babson College: Frank Millerick
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Louis A. Barone
 Ball State University: Don Purvis, John E. Reno, Andrea Seger
 Bard College: Joel Tomson
 Barry University: G. Jean Cerra
 Bates College: Suzanne R. Coffey
 Baylor University: Richard P. Ellis, David M. Guinn, Tom Hill, James S. Netherton, Jeanne P. Nowlin, Grant Teaff
 Bellarmine College: Joseph J. McGowan Jr., David P. O'Toole, James R. Spalding
 Bemidji State University: Tom Richard
 Bennett College: Leon J. McDougale Jr., Tiajuana F. Mosby
 Bentley College: Robert A. DeFelice, Sandra Thompson
 Bernard M. Baruch College: Helen Belden, William Eng
 Bethany College (West Virginia): Donald D. Turner
 Bethel College (Minnesota): David Klostreich
 Bethune-Cookman College: Lynn W. Thompson
 Binghamton, State University of New York at: Judith B. Browne, Stephen P. Erber
 Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Jennie H. Carpenter, Mary Gardner, Brian Johnson, Burton Reese
 Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Norman F. Dahm, Carol Ladwig
 Boston College: Rev. Robert Braunreuther, Mary Miller Carson, Chester S. Gladchuk
 Boston University: Larry Fudge, Averill C. Haines, Linda Martin, Gary Strickler, Chris M. Studer
 Bowdoin College: Sidney J. Watson
 Bowie State University: Charles A. Guilford
 Bowling Green State University: Mary Ellen Cloninger, John C. Gregory, Marvin L. Kumler, Paul J. Olscamp
 Bradley University: John R. Brazil, Ron Ferguson, Ron Koperski
 Brandeis University: Barbara Bickford, Jeffrey W. Cohen

Bridgeport, University of: Ann V. Fariss
 Bridgewater College (Virginia): Thomas M. Kinder
 Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts): John C. Harper
 Brigham Young University: Clayne R. Jensen, Rex E. Lee, Glen C. Tuckett, Lu Wallace
 Brockport, State University College at: Edward Matejkovic, Ginny L. Studer
 Brown University: Karen Appelbaum, Beverly E. Ledbetter, David T. Roach, Joan W. Taylor
 Bryant College: Robert Reall, Jon Sjogren
 Bryn Mawr College: Lisa Boyle, Jenefer P. Shillingford
 Bucknell University: Rick Hartzell, Barbara A. Shailor, Gary A. Sojka, Timothy W. Sweeney, Brad Tufts
 Buena Vista College: Jim Hershberger
 Buffalo, State University College at: Fred J. Hartrick
 Buffalo, State University of New York at: Charles R. Fournier, Michael J. Gentile, William R. Greiner, Nelson E. Townsend, Emily R. Ward
 Butler University: Geoffrey Bannister, Richard E. Martin, John C. Parry

California, University of, Berkeley: Robert L. Bockrath, Jack Citrin, Christine A. Dawson, Robert G. Driscoll, Michael Moss
 California, University of, Davis: Pamela L. Gill-Fisher, Jerry M. Henderson, Theodore L. Hullar, Larry Swanson, Keith Williams
 California, University of, Irvine: Daniel G. Guerrero, Lyman W. Porter, L. Dennis Smith
 California, University of, Los Angeles: Peter T. Dalis, Douglas S. Hobbs, Judith R. Holland
 California, University of, Riverside: Robert Gill, Lorie Harrington, Raymond L. Orbach, James J. Sims
 California, University of, San Diego: Earl W. Edwards, Marilyn Hill, J. Michael Hipp, Heather Mauro, A. W. Russ, Judith M. Sweet
 California, University of, Santa Barbara: Steven Allaback, Alice Henry, John Kasser
 California Institute of Technology: Daniel L. Bridges
 California Lutheran University: Robert Doering, Luther S. Luedtke
 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: John F. McCutcheon, Marilyn McNeil, Michael J. Wenzl
 California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Keith B. Ehrenreich, Karen L. Miller, Bob H. Suzuki
 California State University, Bakersfield: Rudy Carvajal, Brian McNamara
 California State University, Chico: Janet R. Kittell
 California State University, Dominguez Hills: Greg Bistline, Harold Charnofsky
 California State University, Fresno: Gary A. Cunningham, John Easterbrook, Diane Milutinovich, Peter Simis, John D. Welty
 California State University, Fullerton: Judith Anderson, Leon Gilbert, Milton A. Gordon, Bill Shumard
 California State University, Hayward: Kenneth Rebman, F. Douglas Weiss

California State University, Long Beach: David Bernstein, Kay Don, Steve Holton, Curtis L. McCray, David P. O'Brien
 California State University, Los Angeles: Carol M. Dunn, Fleur Yano
 California State University, Northridge: Judith M. Brame, Robert J. Hiebert, Ronald R. Kopita, Blenda J. Wilson
 California State University, Sacramento: Lee A. McElroy, Felicenne Ramey, Irene Shea, Rose Leigh Vines
 California State University, San Bernardino: Barry Knight, David L. Suenram
 California State University, Stanislaus: Joseph T. Donahue
 California University of Pennsylvania: Paul E. Burd, Jay D. Helsel, Thomas G. Pucci
 Calvin College: Beverly Klooster, Doris Zuidema
 Cameron University: Jerry Hrniciar, Kim Vinson, Robert L. Ziegler
 Campbell University: Tom Collins, L. T. Easley, Norman A. Wiggins
 Canisius College: Denise LaRusch, Thomas E. Miller, Daniel P. Starr
 Capital University: Armin P. Langholz
 Carleton College: Leon Lunder
 Carnegie Mellon University: John H. Harvey, Joan E. Maser
 Carroll College: Merle Masonholder
 Carthage College: F. Gregory Campbell
 Case Western Reserve University: Nancy Gray, David M. Hutter, Glenn Nicholls
 Castleton State College: James A. Zalacca
 Catawba College: Ginger Ashley, Dennis J. Haglan, Karl E. Hales
 Catholic University: Jone Dowd, Robert J. Talbot
 Centenary College: Kenneth L. Schwab, Walter C. Stevens
 Central Arkansas, University of: Arvil W. Burks, Bill E. Stephens, Winfred L. Thompson
 Central College (Iowa): Marjorie B. Giles, Richard Kacmarynski, Kenneth J. Weller
 Central Connecticut State University: Judith A. Davidson, Kim E. Hollins, Frank R. A. Resnick
 Central Florida, University of: William G. Callarman, John C. Hitt, Gene McDowell, Art W. Zeleznik
 Central Michigan University: David B. Keilitz, Leonard E. Plachta, Marcy Weston, Jason C. Wilkie
 Central Missouri State University: Ed Elliott, Paul H. Engelmann, Jerry M. Hughes, Crista Troester
 Central Oklahoma, University of: George Nigh, John E. Wagon
 Centre College: Michael F. Adams, Kitty R. Baird, Ray Hammond
 Chadron State College: Bradley R. Smith
 Chaminade University: Rev. Raymond Malley, James E. Martin
 Chapman College: David Currey
 Charleston, College of (South Carolina): Jerry Baker, Otto German, William V. Moore
 Charleston Southern University: Howard Bagwell, Michael T. Hammond, Stephen D. Hudson, Jairy C. Hunter Jr.
 Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Andrew Hinson, Jesse Williams

Chicago, University of: Starkey Duncan, Rosalie Resch, Lorna P. Straus, Thomas Weingartner
 Chicago State University: Albert Avant
 Cincinnati, University of: Nancy R. Hamant, Vincent G. Ille, Joseph A. Steger, Charles F. "Rick" Taylor, George D. Wolterman
 Citadel, The: Walter Nadzak, Col. Gerald L. Runey, Lt. Gen. Claudius E. Watts III
 Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: John Zinda
 Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Robert Carlson, Nancy J. Latimore, Diane L. Reinhard, Hal R. Wassink
 Clark Atlanta University: Jean B. Chandler, Thomas W. Cole Jr., Willie E. Hunter, Sherman Jones, Edward McLean
 Clark University (Massachusetts): Linda S. Moulton
 Clarkson University: William O'Flaherty
 Clemson University: S. Paul Aaron, Cecil O. Huey Jr., Nick Lomak, Dwight Rainey, Linda White
 Cleveland State University: Alice J. Khol, John Konstantinos, Ronald G. Schultz, J. Taylor Sims
 Coastal Carolina College of the University of South Carolina: Jess Dannelly, Andy Hendrick, Linda Hollandsworth, Ronald R. Ingle
 Coe College: Amy Frankenstein
 Colgate University: Braden Houston, Scott Kraly, Janet A. Little, Mark H. Murphy, Martin Scarano
 College Misericordia: Michael W. Mould
 Colorado, University of, Boulder: Judith E. N. Albino, James N. Corbridge Jr., Bill Marolt
 Colorado, University of, Colorado Springs: Theophilus D. Gregory
 Colorado Christian University: Dave E. Foster
 Colorado College: Roxanne Dale, Harold L. Jones, Maxwell F. Taylor
 Colorado School of Mines: R. Bruce Allison, John A. Hogan
 Colorado State University: G. James Francis, Corey Johnson, Marsha Smeltzer
 Columbia University-Barnard College: Petrina M. Long, Merry L. Ormsby, John A. Reeves
 Columbus College: Frank D. Brown
 Concordia College, Moorhead: Armin Piphio
 Concordia College (New York): John A. B. Davis IV
 Connecticut, University of: John L. Allen, Jeffrey A. Hathaway, Patricia H. Meiser-McKnett, Noreen Morris, Lewis Perkins, Mike Zito
 Connecticut College: Claire L. Gaudiani, Robert Malekoff
 Coppin State College: Clayton McNeill
 Cornell College: Ellen Whale
 Cornell University: Brian Austin, Betsy East, Laing E. Kennedy
 Cortland, State University College at: James M. Clark, Lee Roberts
 Creighton University: C. Timothy Dickel, Thomas N. Moore, Bruce Rasmussen
 Curry College: Thomas G. Stephens

 Dartmouth College: Jo Ann Harper, Richard G. Jaeger, M. Lee Pelton, Wendy Gates Troxel

Davidson College: M. Terrence Ronald, John A. Taylor
 Caroline B. Price, J. B. Stroud
 Dayton, University of: R. Elaine Dreidame, Dennis Gerdeman, Thomas J. Westendorf
 Delaware, University of: John L. Burmeister, Mary Ann Hitchens, Edgar N. Johnson
 Delaware State College: William B. DeLauder, Tommy L. Frederick, John C. Martin, Gladys D. W. Motley
 Delaware Valley College: Frank Wolfgang
 Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, Jim Jordan, Kent Wyatt
 Denison University: Robin Bartlett, F. Trevor Gamble, Michele Tolela Myers, Larry Scheiderer
 Denver, University of: Jack McDonald, Daniel L. Ritchie, Mike Thomas, Terrence J. Toy, Diane T. Wendt
 DePaul University: William D. Bradshaw, Richard P. Farkas, Jean Lenti Ponsetto
 DePauw University: Robert G. Bottoms
 Detroit Mercy, University of: John Cochrane, Kenneth Henold, Patricia Kellstrom, Brad Kinsman, Peter Remington
 Dickinson College: Leslie J. Poolman
 District of Columbia, University of: Robin C. Alexander, Emma J. Best, Alvin J. Darby, Dwight F. Datcher
 Dowling College: John F. Dietrich, Robert Dranoff
 Drake University: Jean Berger, Michael R. Ferrari, Chris Gage, Lynn King, Susan E. Wright
 Drew University: Vernon H. Mummert
 Drexel University: Johnson D. Bowie, Barbara Kilgour
 Drury College: Dan Cashel, Barbara Cowherd, Bruce Harger, John E. Moore Jr.
 Duke University: Tom Butters, Mike Krzyzewski, Thomas A. Spragens Jr.
 Duquesne University: William P. Buzzi, Brian Colleary

 Earlham College: Porter G. Miller, Shanna Nolan
 East Carolina University: Charles L. Carr, Richard R. Eakin, Dave Hart Jr., Ernest W. Schwarz
 East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: James E. Gilbert, Roger Gill, Diane Husic, Carey J. Snyder
 East Tennessee State University: Charles E. Clark, Janice C. Shelton
 East Texas State University: Margaret Harbison, Donald A. Ingold, Jerry D. Morris
 Eastern Connecticut State University: David G. Carter, Rhonda Free, Sharlene A. Peter
 Eastern Illinois University: David L. Jorns, Ron Paap, Michael R. Ryan, Robert E. Saltmarsh, Joan K. Schmidt
 Eastern Kentucky University: Robert Baugh, H. Hanly Funderburk Jr.
 Eastern Mennonite College: Ted M. Kinder
 Eastern Michigan University: John R. Adams, Carole J. Huston, William E. Shelton, Eugene D. Smith

Eastern Montana College: Bruce H. Carpenter, Pete LeRoy, Gary Nelson
 Eastern New Mexico University: Thurman Elder, Everett L. Frost, B. B. Lees
 Eastern Washington University: John Johnson, Frank E. Nelson, Pamela A. Parks
 Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: James K. McDonald
 Elizabeth City State University: Willie G. Shaw
 Elizabethtown College: D. Kenneth Ober
 Elmhurst College: Lawrence B. Carroll, Christopher M. Ragsdale
 Elon College: R. Clay Hassard, Alan J. White
 Emory University: Steven Batterson, Chuck Gordon, Sandy Tillman
 Emporia State University: Robert E. Glennen, Wilma Kasnic, William W. Quayle, John Rich
 Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, Linda Crick, J. Robert Knott, James S. Vinson

 Fairfield University: Harold Menninger, Kathryn Nantz, William P. Schimpf
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Hallie Cohen, William T. Klika Jr.
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Roy Danforth, Ann Gulino, Richard Panicucci
 Fayetteville State University: Ralph E. Burns, Clarence White Jr.
 Ferris State University: Dean Davenport, Mark Kosciuszko
 Ferrum College: Hank Norton
 Fitchburg State College: Elizabeth A. Kruczek
 Florida, University of: Nicholas J. Cassisi M.D., Jeremy Foley, Ann Marie Lawler, John V. Lombardi, E. James McCloskey, Greg McGarity, Martha C. Rader
 Florida A&M University: Frederick S. Humphries, Walter Reed
 Florida Atlantic University: Anthony James Catanese, Thomas W. Scott
 Florida Institute of Technology: William K. Jurgens
 Florida International University: Richard J. Correnti, Joyce Elam, Arthur W. Herriott, Richard A. Young
 Florida Southern College: Hal Smeltzly, Lois Webb
 Florida State University: Charles W. Ehrhardt, Bob Goin, Bob Holkeboer, Dale W. Lick, Brian Mand, Todd Markel, Charles B. Reed, Janice M. Stocker
 Fordham University: Francis X. McLaughlin
 Fort Hays State University: Gerry Cox, Edward H. Hammond, Thomas E. Spicer
 Fort Lewis College: Bruce A. Grimes
 Fort Valley State College: Douglas T. Porter
 Framingham State College: Lawrence P. Boyd
 Francis Marion College: Gerald Griffin
 Franklin and Marshall College: John Andrew, Linda E. Hopple, William A. Marshall
 Franklin Pierce College: Bruce Kirsch, Walter Peterson
 Fredonia, State University College at: Everett J. Phillips, Thomas E. Prevet

Frostburg State College: Loyal K. Park
 Furman University: John M. Block, John Burns, Sherry J. Carter, Ray Parlier

 Gallaudet University: Peg Worthington
 Gannon University: Howard Elwell, Charles M. Murphy
 Gardner-Webb College: F. Osborne McFarland
 Geneseo, State University College at: William Caren, John L. Spring
 George Mason University: Michael G. Emsley, Jack E. Kvancz
 George Washington University: Steve Bilsky, Edward A. Caress, Robert A. Chernak, Susie Jones, Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, Mary Jo Warner
 Georgetown University: Adam Brick, Wayne A. Knoll, Joseph C. Lang, Francis X. Rienzo
 Georgia, University of: Gary Couvillon, Vincent J. Dooley, Lee R. Hayley, Charles B. Knapp, Elizabeth Murphey, William M. Powell, Hoke Wilder
 Georgia College: Stan Aldridge, Kurt Hofmann
 Georgia Institute of Technology: John P. Crecine, Bernadette V. McGlade, Bernard McGregor, James E. Murphy III, Homer C. Rice, William M. Sangster
 Georgia Southern University: G. Lane Van Tassell, David B. Wagner
 Georgia State University: Blaine Hughes, James H. Maxey, Orby Moss Jr.
 Gettysburg College: Charles W. Winters
 Gonzaga University: John J. Preston
 Gordon College: Walter Bowman
 Goucher College: William J. Kaiser
 Grambling State University: Wilbert Ellis, A. Lane Howell, Harold W. Lundy
 Grand Canyon University: B. Keith Baker
 Grand Valley State University: Joan Boand, Mary L. Horan, Michael J. Kovalchik, Arend D. Lubbers
 Grinnell College: Diane Fairchild
 Grove City College: R. Jack Behringer
 Guilford College: Gayle Currie, Laura Klingseisen
 Gustavus Adolphus College: James M. Malmquist

 Hamilton College: Robert Simon
 Hampden-Sydney College: Joe Bush
 Hampton University: Lenora E. Armstrong, Ollie Bowman, Christal B. Holmes, Dennis Thomas
 Hanover College: Lynn Hall, Dick Naylor, Russell L. Nichols, Stanley M. Totten
 Hartford, University of: Denise Cohen, Lewis R. Tucker
 Hartwick College: Kenneth Kutler
 Harvard University: Jennifer Bates, William J. Cleary Jr., Harry Lewis, Marcella K. Zalot
 Haverford College: Penelope C. Hinckley, Gregory Kannerstein, Matthew Leighninger

Hawaii, University of: Kaia Hedlund, Marilyn Moniz-Kahoochanohano, Stanley B. Sheriff
 Henderson State University: Charles D. Dunn, David Gardner
 Hendrix College: Ann H. Die
 Hilbert College: Luke Matthew Ruppel
 Hillsdale College: Mickey Craig, Jack H. McAvoy
 Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Michael J. Hanna, Connee Zotos
 Hofstra University: Peter M. Fishbein, James V. Garvey, James M. Stuart
 Hollins College: Lynda J. Calkins
 Holy Cross College: Rev. John E. Brooks, Ronald S. Perry
 Hope College: Anne Irwin
 Houston, University of: James R. Benbrook, Conrad Colbert, Bill McGillis, James H. Pickering, Andrew Szilagyi
 Howard University: Steve Favors, Deborah K. Johnson, Sondra Norrell-Thomas, David C. Simmons, A. B. Williamson
 Humboldt State University: Charles N. Lindemann, John Yarnall
 Hunter College: Terry A. Wansart

Idaho, University of: Kathy Clark, W. Harold Godwin, Pete Liske
 Idaho State University: Ken Bothof, Richard L. Bowen, Nancy Graziano, Randy Hoffman, Cornelius A. Hofman
 Illinois, University of, Champaign: David L. Chicoine, Mildred B. Griggs, Ronald E. Guenther, Karol A. Kahrs
 Illinois, University of, Chicago: Jonathan C. Darby, Marie L. Robinson, Thomas F. Russo, James W. Schmidt, Barbara S. Wood
 Illinois College: William A. Anderson
 Illinois State University: Linda Herman, Albert Otto, Donna Taylor, Thomas P. Wallace
 Illinois Wesleyan University: Barbara Cothren
 Immaculata College: Lynne Reichert
 Indiana State University: C. Sue Davis, Brian D. Faison, John C. Jessell, John W. Moore, Andrea Myers
 Indiana University, Bloomington: Clarence H. Doninger, Thomas Ehrlich, Isabella Hutchison, Haydn H. Murray, Mary Ann Rohleder
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Frank Cignetti, David A. DeCoster, Lawrence K. Pettit, Erika Renwick, John C. Thomas
 Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne: Robert A. Barrett
 Indianapolis, University of: Kenneth D. Borden, William A. Bright
 Iona College: Brother John Driscoll, Timothy Murray, Rich Petriccione
 Iowa, University of: Robert Bowlsby, Christine H. B. Grant, W. Fred Mims, Hunter R. Rawlings III, Bonnie Slatton
 Iowa State University: Norman L. Boyles, Martin C. Jischke, Max F. Urlick
 Ithaca College: Robert C. Deming, Kristen M. Ford, Bonnie J. Gordon, Thomas C. Longin, Francine Montemurro, Peter Moore, James J. Whalen

Jackson State University: Melvin I. Evans, W. C. Gorden, James E. Lyons, Sadie Magee
 Jacksonville State University: Jerry N. Cole, Harold J. McGee
 Jacksonville University: Glenda Persons, Thomas M. Seitz
 James Madison University: Brad Babcock, O. Dean Ehlers, Janet D. Lucas, Dennis E. Robison, Robert Scott
 Jarvis Christian College: Robert E. Thomas
 Jersey City State College: Lawrence R. Schiner
 John Carroll University: Tony DeCarlo, Rev. Michael J. Lavelle
 John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Susan Larkin
 Johns Hopkins University: Sally Beth Anderson, Thomas P. Calder, Robert H. Scott
 Johnson C. Smith University: Phyllis Worthy Dawkins, Horace T. Small
 Juniata College: William F. Berrier

Kansas, University of: Del Brinkman, Robert E. Frederick, Richard Konzem, Betsy G. Stephenson
 Kansas State University: Jim Epps, Patti Hagemeyer, Robert S. Krause, Robert R. Snell, Jon Wefald
 Kean College: Glenn Hedden
 Keene State College: Mary V. Conway, Joanne A. Fortunato
 Kent State University: Paul V. Amodio, Judy Devine, William Konnert
 Kentucky, University of: Virginia A. Atwood, Kathleen J. DeBoer, C. M. Newton, Charles T. Wethington Jr.
 Kentucky State University: Donald W. Lyons, Cassie Osborne Jr.
 Kentucky Wesleyan College: J. Robert Cockrum
 Kenyon College: Robert D. Bunnell
 King's College: John J. Dorish
 Knox College: Harlan Knosher
 Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: David McFarland, Betty G. Wesner

La Salle University: Joseph F. Burke, Kathleen M. McNally, Robert Mullen, Annette O'Connor
 La Verne, University of: Jimmy M. Paschal
 Lafayette College: Eve Atkinson, Bruce E. McCutcheon
 Lake Superior State University: James Fallis, Charles W. Jones
 Lamar University: W. Brock Brentlinger, Larry W. Spradley, Bruce E. Stracener
 Lander College: Betty H. Williams
 Le Moyne College: Rev. Kevin G. O'Connell, Richard W. Rockwell
 Lebanon Valley College: Louis A. Sorrentino, Kathleen Tierney
 Lehigh University: Karen Adams, Joseph D. Sterrett
 Lehman College: Raymond F. Salvestrini Jr.
 Lenoir-Rhyne College: Robert C. Heller, Rufus L. Moretz, Keith M. Ochs
 Lewis University: Raphael Mascari, Paul Ruddy
 Liberty University: Chuck Burch, A. Pierre Guillermin, Mike Hall

Lincoln Memorial University: Earl D. Brooks II, Dave Hyatt, Scott D. Miller
 Lincoln University (Missouri): Richard Cosby, Lucius Jones, Mary Beth Ochsner, David L. Shinholster
 Livingston University: Asa N. Green, Billy B. Slay, Louis R. Smith Jr.
 Livingstone College: Delano W. Tucker
 Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Sharon E. Taylor
 Long Island University-Brooklyn Center: Margaret Alaimo
 Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus: Vincent Salamone
 Longwood College: William F. Dorrill, Emily H. Harsh
 Loras College: Robert Bierie
 Louisiana State University: David Bahnsen, William E. Davis, Joe Dean, Sam B. Hilliard
 Louisiana Tech University: Jerry W. Andrews, Daniel D. Reneau, Jerry L. Stovall
 Louisville, University of: Dennis C. Golden, William C. Olsen, Arthur M. Riehl, Donald C. Swain
 Loyola College (Maryland): Diane M. Aikens, Joseph Boylan
 Loyola Marymount University: Lane Bove, Bonnie Frankel, Brian Quinn
 Loyola University (Illinois): Carolyn V. O'Connell, Samuel P. Ramenofsky, Charles T. Schwarz
 Luther College: Andrea Wickerham
 Lynchburg College: Jack M. Toms

Macalester College: Kenneth W. Andrews
 Maine, University of: Linwood Carville, George L. Jacobson, Anne McCoy, Michael A. Ploszek
 Manchester College: William P. Robinson
 Manhattan College: Robert J. Byrnes, E. Joseph Lee, Brother Thomas J. Scanlan
 Manhattanville College: Theodore H. Kolva Jr.
 Mankato State University: Don Amiot, Georgene Brock, Ronald L. Hybertson, Richard R. Rush
 Marietta College: Jeanne A. Arbuckle, Debora Lazorik
 Marist College: Eugene Doris, Alison Sexton
 Maritime College, State University of New York: James Migli
 Marquette University: William L. Cords, Rev. Albert J. DiUlio, Carla H. Hay, Tat Shiely
 Mars Hill College: William Hutt
 Marshall University: Jack Daniels, Dorothy E. Hicks, William Lee Moon Sr.
 Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: Charles R. Brown, Freeman Hrabowski, Susan Kitchen, John Kloetzel, Kathleen G. Zerlaut
 Maryland, University of, College Park: Ferdinand A. Geiger, William E. Kirwan, Betty F. Smith, Suzanne Tyler
 Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Henry M. Brooks, Hallie E. Gregory
 Maryville University of St. Louis: David R. Pierce
 Massachusetts, University of, Amherst: Carol A. Barr, Aloysius N.

Rufe, Elaine Sortino, Elizabeth Tuthill, T. Jesse Wilde, Glenn M. Wong
 Massachusetts, University of, Boston: Mary R. Barrett
 Massachusetts, University of, Dartmouth: Robert A. Dowd
 Massachusetts, University of, Lowell: R. Wayne Edwards, Linda H. Kistler
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Jane Betts, Richard A. Hill
 McNeese State University: Tommy E. Bogle, Robert G. Hayes, Robert D. Hebert, Ron LeLeux
 Medgar Evers College: Roy Anderson
 Memphis State University: Charles Cavagnaro, Lynn Parkes, V. Lane Rawlins, Timothy L. Sumner, Nicholas L. White
 Mercer University: Benjamin S. Kelley, Bobby Pope
 Mercy College: Neil D. Judge
 Mercyhurst College: Peter J. Russo
 Merrimack College: Rev. John E. Deegan, Robert M. DeGregorio Jr.
 Messiah College: Barbara Burwell, Ronald Burwell, Layton Shoemaker
 Metropolitan State College of Denver: Charles M. Dobbs, William Helman
 Miami, University of (Florida): Rick Greenspan, L. Douglas Johnson, David L. Maggard
 Miami University (Ohio): Harold W. Jasper, R. C. Johnson, Paul G. Risser, Karen Womack
 Michigan, University of: Percy Bates, Margaret J. Bradley-Doppes, George W. Hoey, Jack P. Weidenbach
 Michigan State University: Merrily Dean Baker, Gordon E. Guyer, Michael L. Kasavana, Kathy Lindahl, Clarence Underwood Jr.
 Michigan Technological University: Darrell W. Smith, J. Richard Yeo
 Middle Tennessee State University: Race P. Bergman, John E. Stanford, James E. Walker
 Middlebury College: G. Thomas Lawson
 Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Tom Burns, Gene A. Carpenter, Russell L. De Souza, Marjorie A. Trout
 Millikin University: Merle W. Chapman
 Millsaps College: George M. Harmon, Robert C. King
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Gregory Fox, Linda Larson, Bruce M. McLeod, Patricia A. Merrier
 Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities: McKinley Boston, Jo-Ida C. Hansen, Nils Hasselmo, Jeff Schemmel, Robert A. Stein, Chris Voelz
 Mississippi, University of: Warner Alford, Kathryn R. Strickland, R. Gerald Turner, David K. Wells, Max W. Williams, Les Wyatt
 Mississippi College: Terry McMillan, Lewis Nobles
 Mississippi State University: David C. Boles, Willie L. McDaniel, Walter B. Newsom, Larry O. Templeton
 Mississippi University for Women: Clyda S. Rent, Jo Spearman
 Mississippi Valley State University: Reginal L. Henderson, Charles Prophet, William W. Sutton
 Missouri, University of, Columbia: Joe Castiglione, Dan Devine, Charles A. Kiesler, Carl Settergren

Missouri, University of, Kansas City: J. Joseph Doerr, Ed Grom
 Missouri, University of, Rolla: Lawrence O. Christensen, Mark E. Mullin, John T. Park
 Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Thomas Schnell, Denise Silvester, Charles G. Smith
 Missouri Southern State College: Sallie Beard, James L. Frazier, Wayne A. Harrell
 Missouri Western State College: James W. Grechus, Ed B. Harris
 Molloy College: Harry Herman, Robert C. Houlihan
 Monmouth College (New Jersey): Samuel H. Magill, Joan Martin, Marilyn A. Parker
 Montana, University of: George M. Dennison, Robert Lindsay, William Moos, Kathy Noble
 Montana State University: Douglas B. Fullerton, Edward L. Hanson, Virginia Hunt, Michael P. Malone
 Montclair State College: Holly P. Gera, Gregory L. Lockard, Irvin D. Reid
 Moravian College: John Makuvek Jr.
 Morehead State University: W. Michael Brown, Ronald G. Eaglin, Steve Hamilton, Keith Kappes
 Morgan State University: George R. Carter, Raymond A. Downs
 Morningside College: Joan McDermott, Sharon Ocker
 Mount Holyoke College: Laurie Priest
 Mount St. Mary's College (Maryland): J. Thomas Balistrere
 Mount Union College: Sandy Douglas
 Muhlenberg College: Ralph Kirchenheiter
 Murray State University: Ronald J. Kurth, Margaret Simmons, Michael D. Strickland

Nazareth College (New York): William H. Carey
 Nebraska, University of, at Kearney: Dick Beechner
 Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Don Bryant, Bill Byrne, Robert S. Devaney, Barbara A. Hibner, James O'Hanlon, Al Papik, Graham Spanier
 Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Connie J. Claussen, Robert B. Flynn, Robert F. Gibson
 Nebraska Wesleyan University: Nancy J. Hansen, Mary Beth Kennedy
 Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Paul E. Burns, David Chambers, Lisa Kelleher, Robert C. Maxson, Keith R. Tribble, Jim Weaver
 Nevada, University of, Reno: Chris Ault, Joseph N. Crowley, Christopher H. Exline, Keith L. Lee, Angela D. Taylor
 New Hampshire, University of: John H. Lawson, Dale F. Nitzschke, David O'Connor, Judith L. Ray
 New Haven, University of: Deborah Chin, William M. Leete Jr.
 New Mexico, University of: Rudy Davalos, Robert J. Desiderio, Linda K. Estes, Richard E. Peck
 New Mexico Highlands University: Robert N. Evers
 New Mexico State University: Karen Fey, James T. Fisher, Albert T. Gonzales, James E. Halligan
 New Orleans, University of: H. Hugh Floyd, Ronald J. Maestri, Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien, Donald A. Pekarek

New Paltz, State University College at: Alice Chandler
 New Rochelle, College of: Kathleen LeVache
 New York, City College of: Paul Bobb
 New York Institute of Technology: Clyde Doughty Jr.
 New York University: Jack E. Peckett, Daniel E. Quilty
 Niagara University: Barbara A. Green, Michael L. Jankowski
 Nicholls State University: Phil Greco
 Norfolk State University: William L. Price, P. LaVerne Sweat
 North Adams State College: Joseph Zavattaro
 North Alabama, University of: Bill Jones, Robert L. Potts, Robert D. Young
 North Carolina, University of, Asheville: Dede M. Allen, Eric Iovacchini
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Richard A. Baddour, Jeff Elliott, Paul Hardin, Richard G. Hiskey, Beth Miller, John D. Swofford
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: Philip Dubois, David Goldfield, Kim Green, Judy W. Rose, James H. Woodward
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: James H. Allen, Nelson E. Bobb, Steve Danford, David B. Knight, William E. Moran, James R. Wyatt
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: Pat Howey, Paul A. Miller
 North Carolina A&T State University: Dorothy Alston, Willie J. Burden, Edward B. Fort, James A. Williams Jr.
 North Carolina Central University: Les Brinson, Carey Hughley, Sandra Shuler
 North Carolina State University: Arthur W. Cooper, Nora Lynn Finch, Eric Hyman, James D. Miller, Larry K. Monteith, Todd Turner
 North Carolina Wesleyan College: C. Michael Fox
 North Central College: Walter J. Johnson, Howard Mueller
 North Dakota, University of: Kendall L. Baker, George W. Schubert, Terry Wanless
 North Dakota State University: Lynn Dorn, Robert Entzion, Allan G. Fischer, Dan Summy
 North Park College: Jerry Chaplin, David Horner
 North Texas, University of: Blaine A. Brownell, Alfred F. Hurley, Lynda Nygren, Steve Sloan, John Thornton, George C. Young
 Northeast Louisiana University: Maynard M. Dolecheck, Benny Hollis, Lawson L. Swearingen Jr.
 Northeast Missouri State University: Susie Bair, Alan R. Graham, Walter H. Ryle
 Northeastern Illinois University: Barbara Bales, Vivian L. Fuller, Lynn Gaziano, Gordon H. Lamb
 Northeastern University: Kristin L. Burns, Irwin M. Cohen, J. Lin Dawson, David Frazier, Richard Lapchick, Robert W. McCabe, M. Adekunle Raji
 Northern Arizona University: Eugene M. Hughes, Tom Jurich, Sam F. McClanahan, Kelly Patton Woodward
 Northern Colorado, University of: Robert L. Heiny, Susan M. Jacobson, Herman D. Lujan

Northern Illinois University: Robert Collins, Ray Dembinski, Cary Groth, John E. La Tourette, Gerald K. O'Dell, Jim Schaus
 Northern Iowa, University of: John E. Conner, Christopher Ritrievi, Jack D. Wilkinson, Sandra C. Williamson
 Northern Kentucky University: Thomas J. Kearns, Jane Meier
 Northern Michigan University: Richard B. Comley, Harold Dorf, R. Thomas Peters Jr.
 Northwest Missouri State University: Virgil Albertini, Sherri Reeves
 Northwestern State University (Louisiana): Robert A. Alost, Greg Harrod, Tynes Hildebrand, Jerry Pierce, Craig Rex
 Northwestern University: Bruce A. Corrie, Frederick Hemke, Betsy J. Mosher
 Northwood University: David W. Coffey
 Notre Dame, College of (California): Virginia Babel
 Notre Dame, College of (Maryland): Donna M. Ledwin
 Notre Dame, University of: Rev. E. William Beauchamp, Brian M. Boulac, Melissa L. Conboy, Joe O'Brien, Richard A. Rosenthal

 Oakland University: Paul E. Hartman, Glenn A. Jackson
 Oberlin College: George Andrews, James E. Foels, Patrice A. Milkovich
 Occidental College: Ralph L. Amey, Dale V. Widolff
 Ohio Northern University: Gale E. Daugherty
 Ohio State University: Phyllis J. Bailey, James L. Jones, Carol W. Kennedy, Bill Myles
 Ohio University: Mary C. Keifer, Harold N. McElhaney, Peggy J. Pruitt, Jessie C. Robertson Jr.
 Ohio Wesleyan University: David L. Warren
 Oklahoma, University of: Donnie Duncan, Daniel G. Gibbens, Lawrence E. Naifeh, Richard L. Van Horn
 Oklahoma State University: Ann Baer, Robert A. Burton, John R. Campbell, James Garner, Gerald M. Lage, Marty Sargent
 Old Dominion University: Mikki Flowers, James Jarrett, Janis Sanchez
 Old Westbury, State University College at: Theodora Ierides
 Olivet College: Dallas Hilliar
 Oneonta, State University College at: James F. Baker, Albert H. Sosa
 Oregon, University of: Gary Gray, James M. O'Fallon, Barbara Walker, Dan Williams
 Oregon State University: Dutch Baughman, Michael Beachley, Patricia M. Drapela, Robert J. Frank
 Oswego, State University College at: Sandra L. Moore
 Otterbein College: Marilyn E. Day

 Pace University: Christopher Bledsoe, Walter Raubichcek
 Pacific (California), University of the: Bill L. Atchley, Donald W. Bryan, Christina L. Kunzer-Murphy, Bob Lee
 Paine College: Ronnie O. Spry
 Parks College of St. Louis University: Gerald D. Kurfman

Pembroke State University: Bruce W. Mattox Sr., Joseph B. Oxendine, Ray Pennington
 Pennsylvania, University of: D. Elton Cochran-Fikes, Nicholas D. Constan Jr., Carolyn Schlie Femovich, Paul R. Rubincam Jr.
 Pennsylvania State University: Elizabeth Fahey Albright, John J. Coyle, Ellen L. Perry, James I. Tarman, Joab L. Thomas
 Pennsylvania State University-Behrend College: John N. Grode, Herbert J. Lauffer
 Pepperdine University: Roxanne K. Levenson, Wayne Wright
 Pittsburg State University: Ellen Carter, Glen D. McLaren, William O. Samuels
 Pittsburgh, University of: John W. Blanton, John O. Bolvin, L. Oval Jaynes, Donna Sanft, Carol J. Sprague
 Plattsburg, State University College at: Peter P. Luguri
 Plymouth State College: Stephen R. Bamford
 Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Curtis W. Tong
 Portland, University of: Joseph A. Etzel
 Portland State University: Randy Nordlof, Judith A. Ramaley
 Potsdam, State University College at: Charles Foster
 Prairie View A&M University: Ronald D. Beard, Julius W. Becton Jr., Barbara Jackel, Mary V. White
 Presbyterian College: Calhoun F. Gault, Thomas A. Stallworth
 Princeton University: Amy Campbell, Robert J. Myslik, George H. VanderZwaag
 Principia College: E. Lawrence Gerber
 Providence College: John M. Marinatto, Patricia D. Nichol
 Purdue University: Steven C. Beering, Morgan Burke, Martha O. Chiscon, Joni Comstock, Philip E. Nelson

 Queens College (New York): Merlin Thompson
 Quinnipiac College: Burt Kahn

 Radford University: Greig Denny, Charles L. Hayes, Chuck Taylor, Ronald C. Witherow Jr.
 Randolph-Macon College: Theodore S. Keller, Helmut Werner
 Redlands, University of: Christopher Walker, Greg Warzecka
 Regis College (Massachusetts): Judith W. Burling
 Regis University (Colorado): Tom Dedin, Barbara Schroeder
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte, Kerry Quinn, Lee Wilcox
 Rhode Island, University of: Anthony Adams, Lauren E. Anderson, Robert Carothers, Ronald J. Petro, Albert H. Taubman
 Rhode Island College: Gail H. Davis
 Rice University: James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman, James Harris, Martha E. Hawthorne, John R. May, Steven Moniaci
 Richmond, University of: Harold W. Babb, Charles S. Boone, Ruth Goehring
 Rider College: Curtis W. Blake, Joseph M. Gowaskie, Viola Udy
 Ripon College: Michele Wittler
 Roanoke College: M. Scott Allison
 Robert Morris College: Robert D. McBee, Edward A. Nicholson,

Robert W. Norberg
 Rochester, University of: Joyce Wong
 Rochester Institute of Technology: Terence C. Morrill, Louis W. Spiotti
 Rockford College: William F. Langston
 Roger Williams College: Patricia Bedard
 Rollins College: J. Philip Roach
 Rowan College of New Jersey: Joy Reign
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Frederick E. Gruninger, Francis L. Lawrence, Malcolm G. McLaren, Paul R. Vitek
 Rutgers University, Newark: John K. Adams, Florence A. Labenski, James H. Ramsey
 Sacred Heart University: C. Donald Cook, Elizabeth Luckie, Dan A. Pannese
 Saginaw Valley State University: Robert T. Becker, George W. Eastland Jr.
 St. Anselm College: Theodore S. Paulauskas
 St. Augustine's College: Wanzo F. Hendrix
 St. Benedict, College of: Carol Howe-Veenstra, Lu Ann Reif
 St. Bonaventure University: Barbara Hick, Very Rev. Neil J. O'Connell, Thomas J. O'Connor
 St. Cloud State University: Robert O. Bess, Dianne Glowatzke, Arthur F. Grachek, Morris Kurtz
 St. Francis College (New York): James G. Thompson
 St. Francis College (Pennsylvania): Katherine R. Lammon, Rev. Christian Oravec, Frank Pergolizzi, Deborah M. Polca
 St. John's University (Minnesota): James T. Murphy
 St. John's University (New York): George R. Bisacca, Margaret Mary Fitzpatrick, John W. Kaiser, Richard J. Krempecki, Kathleen Meehan
 St. Joseph's College (Indiana): Brian K. Simmons
 St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania): Don J. DiJulia, Joseph M. Lunardi, David A. Merrick, Stephen J. Porth, Rev. Nicholas Rashford
 St. Lawrence University: John A. Clark, Peter Fitzrandolph, Randolph W. LaBrake
 St. Leo College: John Schaly
 St. Louis University: Lori A. Flanagan, Michael J. Ross, Robert Sheeran, Deborah A. Yow
 St. Mary's College (California): Richard Mazzuto, William McLeod
 St. Mary's College (Indiana): Jo-Ann E. Nester
 St. Mary's College (Minnesota): Linda Anderson
 St. Mary's College of Maryland: Joseph Gardiner
 St. Michael's College: Edward P. Markey
 St. Norbert College: Larry Van Alstine
 St. Olaf College: James Dimick
 St. Paul's College: Sunday A. Adesuyi, Harold L. Williams
 St. Peter's College: William A. Stein
 St. Rose, College of: Catherine C. Haker
 St. Scholastica, College of: Kevin C. Snyder

St. Thomas (Minnesota), University of: Jo Ann Andregg
 Salem State College: John D. Galaris
 Salisbury State University: Dawn Chamberlin, Cheryl Ish, William E. Lide, Michael P. Vienna
 Salve Regina University: Lynn Sheedy
 Sam Houston State University: Martin J. Anisman, Ronnie Choate, Tom Davis, Bobby K. Marks, Bobby R. Williams Jr.
 Samford University: Stephen C. Allgood, Thomas E. Corts
 San Diego, University of: Thomas Innacone, Regina Sullivan
 San Diego State University: Jayne Hancock, James G. Malik, Fred L. Miller
 San Francisco, University of: Sandee L. Hill, William J. Hogan
 San Francisco State University: William E. Partlow
 San Jose State University: Thomas Brennan, Carolyn M. Lewis, Charles Whitcomb
 Santa Clara University: Amy E. Hackett, Carroll M. Williams
 Savannah College of Art and Design: Karen A. Ryan
 Savannah State College: William R. Davis Sr., Charles J. Elmore
 Scranton, University of: Gary N. Wodder
 Seattle Pacific University: Wesley Lingren, Keith R. Phillips
 Seton Hall University: George P. Browne, Sue C. Dilley, Laurence C. Keating Jr., Rev. Thomas R. Peterson
 Shaw University: Dianthia M. Ford, Ernest L. Pickens, Keith Smith
 Shepherd College: J. Michael Jacobs
 Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania: Anthony F. Ceddia, Jane G. Goss, C. William Knerr, James G. Pribula
 Siena College: John D'Argenio, Joyce A. Legere, William McConville
 Simpson College: John F. Sirianni
 Skidmore College: Tim Brown
 Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania: Robertha Abney, Robert N. Aebersold, William C. Lennox
 Smith College: Linda C. Hackett, Lynn Oberbillig
 Sonoma State University: Ruben Arminana, Ralph Barkey, Duncan E. Poland
 South, University of: Willard Huyck
 South Alabama, University of: Joe Gottfried, Hal Williams
 South Carolina, University of, at Aiken: Douglas R. Warrick
 South Carolina, University of, Columbia: Sandra L. Robinson
 South Carolina, University of, at Spartanburg: Daniel Codespoti, Olin B. Sansbury Jr.
 South Carolina State University: Oscar P. Butler Jr., Robert Chatman, Arthur Smith
 South Dakota, University of: Jack F. Doyle, John M. Hilpert, George R. Horner, Mary Mock
 South Dakota State University: Mylo A. Hellickson, Fred M. Oien, Robert T. Wagner
 South Florida, University of: Francis T. Borkowski, Paul S. Griffin, Barbara Sparks-McGlinchy, Stewart W. Schneller
 Southampton Campus of Long Island University: Mary E. Topping
 Southeast Missouri State University: Joseph H. Low Jr., Richard A. McDuffie, Kala M. Stroup

Southeastern Louisiana University: Billy Bond, Bob Butler, Tom Douple, G. Warren Smith
 Southern California, University of: Jim Dennis, Lisa Love, Noel Ragsdale
 Southern Colorado, University of: Patrick Bottini, Dan DeRose, Marcie L. Reynolds, Robert C. Shirley
 Southern Connecticut State University: Michael J. Adanti, Louise Albrecht, Roger J. Bergh, Lawrence E. Fitzgerald, Anthony Martone, Darryl Rogers
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: John J. Cody, James Hart, Margaret Matthias, Charlotte West
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Cynthia Jones
 Southern Indiana, University of: Donald D. Bennett, Charles J. Bertram
 Southern Maine, University of: Paula D. Hodgdon, Remo H. Riciputi
 Southern Methodist University: Forrest Gregg, Charles Howard, A. Kenneth Pye, C. Paul Rogers III, Kyle O'Brien Stevens
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Ralph N. Floyd Jr., Helen Grant, Aubrey K. Lucas, Ronald G. Marquardt, H. C. McLellan
 Southern University, Baton Rouge: Marino H. Casem, Robert H. Cobbins, Marvin L. Yates
 Southern Utah University: Kathryn Berg, Jack Bishop, David R. Braegger, Michael Richards
 Southwest Baptist University: John A. Bryant, Gary De Bauche, Stephanie Miller
 Southwest Missouri State University: Larry L. George, Russell M. Keeling, Bill O'Neill, Gregory P. Onstot, Bill Rowe, Mary Jo Wynn
 Southwest Texas State University: Michael Abbott, Dana L. Craft, Richard Hannan, Jerome H. Supple
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Ray P. Authement, Gerard L. St. Martin, Nelson J. Schexnayder Jr.
 Southwestern University (Texas): Carla Lowry, Glada Munt, Roy B. Shilling Jr.
 Springfield College: Edward Bilik, Scott Nichols
 Stanford University: Susan Simoni Burk, Edward Leland, Cheryl L. Levick, Jerry I. Porras
 Staten Island, College of: Joseph Barresi
 Stephen F. Austin State University: Dan Angel, Matt Fenley, Darren Fort, Steve McCarty, Baker Pattillo
 Stetson University: Robert J. Jacoby, Elizabeth J. Schumaker
 Stevens Institute of Technology: Frank J. Rotunda
 Stockton State College: G. Larry James
 Stony Brook, State University of New York at: Paul J. Dudzick, Sandra R. Weeden
 Suffolk University: James E. Nelson
 Susquehanna University: Connie Harnum, Donald Harnum
 Swarthmore College: Robert E. Williams
 Syracuse University: David H. Bennett, John J. Crouthamel, John P. Hardt, Kenneth A. Shaw, Doris R. Soladay

 Tampa, University of: Hindman Wall
 Temple University: Joseph W. Marshall, Charles Theokas, Michéle O. Willis

Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: Edward G. Farrell, Frederick W. Obear, Paul J. Watson
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Carl W. Asp, Joan C. Cronan, Douglas A. Dickey, Joseph E. Johnson, Malcolm C. McInnis Jr., Philip A. Scheurer, William T. Snyder
 Tennessee, University of, Martin: Ernest W. Blythe Jr., Nick Dunagan, Margaret N. Perry
 Tennessee State University: Lula S. Collier, Bernard G. Crowell, William Thomas
 Tennessee Technological University: Thurston E. Banks, David L. Larimore, Angelo A. Volpe
 Texas, University of, at Arlington: Ryan C. Amacher, Pete Carlon, Bill Reeves, W. R. Ross, B. J. Skelton
 Texas, University of, at Austin: Katy Arris, Jody Conratt, DeLoss Dodds, Beverly Hadaway, William Livingston, Edwin R. Sharpe, James W. Vick, James G. Worley
 Texas, University of, at El Paso: Brad W. Hovious, Maxine V. Neill-Johnson
 Texas, University of, Pan American: Gary Gallup, Miguel A. Nevarez, Jerry L. Pulley
 Texas, University of, at San Antonio: Samuel A. Kirkpatrick, Bobby Thompson
 Texas A&I University: Kay Clayton, Ron Harms, Manuel L. Ibanez
 Texas A&M University: Thomas W. Adair III, Tina Cheatham, John David Crow, William H. Mobley, Karl P. Mooney, Tedi Zalesky
 Texas Christian University: Carolyn J. Dixon, Joseph W. Helmick, Melvin E. Thomas, William E. Tucker, Frank R. Windegger
 Texas Southern University: Willie Criddle, Rick Holden, Porter Robinson Jr., W. Curtis Williams
 Texas Tech University: T. Jones, Robert W. Lawless, Jeannine McHaney, Taylor McNeel, Robert M. Sweazy
 Texas Woman's University: Diana Everett, Judy Southard, G. Ann Uhler, Frank Vitro
 Thiel College: John Dickason
 Thomas More College: Victor A. Clark, William F. Cleves
 Toledo, University of: Allen R. Bohl, Peter Fields, Frank E. Horton, James M. Klein, Marnie W. Swift
 Towson State University: Annette Ezell, Bill Hunter, Nance Reed, Jay Stanley
 Trenton State College: Kevin A. McHugh
 Trinity College (Connecticut): Richard J. Hazelton, Robin L. Sheppard
 Trinity University (Texas): Scott T. Chapman, Julie Jenkins, Gene Norris
 Troy State University: Kenneth S. Blankenship, Doug Hawkins, Jack Hawkins Jr., Doug Patterson
 Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo, John A. Di Biaggio
 Tulane University: Anne S. Barbour, Milton Fingerma, Eamon M. Kelly, Kevin M. White
 Tulsa, University of: Rick Dickson, Barry A. Kinsey, Judy MacLeod
 Tuskegee University: William L. Lester, James A. Martin Sr.

U.S. Air Force Academy: Col. Robert B. Giffen, Lt. Gen. Bradley C. Hosmer, Donald T. Kidd, Ken Schweitzer, William Stinson
 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Susan Petersen Lubow
 U.S. Military Academy: Lt. Gen. Howard D. Graves, Col. Daniel M. Litynski, Bill Schutsky, Col. Albert Vanderbush
 U.S. Naval Academy: Jack Lengyel, Rear Adm. Thomas C. Lynch, Richard D. Mathieu, Mary McElroy
 Union College (New York): Richard S. Sakala
 Upper Iowa University: Ted Eilders, Ralph L. McKay
 Upsala College: Michael J. Walsh
 Ursinus College: Adele P. Boyd
 Utah, University of: Fern Gardner, Larry R. Gerlach, Christopher P. Hill, Arthur K. Smith
 Utah State University: George H. Emert, E. Kaye Hart, Joseph G. Morse, Michael Parent
 Utica College: Ronald Danilowicz, Michael K. Simpson, James A. Spartano

 Valdosta State College: Herb Reinhard, Charles R. Tucker
 Valparaiso University: Alan F. Harre, William L. Steinbrecher
 Vanderbilt University: Thomas G. Burish, Paul J. Hoolahan, June Stewart, Joe B. Wyatt
 Vassar College: Valerie Cushman, Andrew M. Jennings
 Vermont, University of: Rosalind E. Andreas, Richard A. Farnham, Sally Guerette
 Villanova University: Ted Aceto, Mary Anne Dowling, Daniel T. Regan
 Virginia, University of: James W. Blackburn, W. James Copeland, Jane Miller, Lynn M. Mitchell, D. Alan Williams
 Virginia Commonwealth University: Deborah L. Cowles, Alfreeda Goff, Richard L. Sander, Eugene P. Trani
 Virginia Military Institute: Davis Babb, Col. Thomas W. Davis, John W. Knapp, Chip Smith
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: David T. Braine, Stephen J. Horton, Larry N. Killough, Sharon L. McCloskey
 Virginia State University: Arnold R. Henderson, Paulette Walker Johnson
 Virginia Union University: James F. Battle
 Virginia Wesleyan College: Donald M. Forsythe

 Wabash College: Joseph O'Rourke
 Wagner College: Walter C. Hameline
 Wake Forest University: Dianne Dailey, Thomas K. Hearn Jr., Ron Wellman, Edwin G. Wilson
 Wartburg College: Darold M. Wolff
 Washburn University of Topeka: Larry D. Blumberg, Janet M. Degginger, Richard A. Johanningmeier, Jenny Klammm, Hugh L. Thompson
 Washington, University of: Richard J. Dunn, Catherine B. Green, Barbara A. Hedges

Washington and Jefferson College: John J. Gregor
 Washington and Lee University: Cinda L. Rankin, Michael F. Walsh
 Washington College (Maryland): Geoffrey M. Miller
 Washington State University: Barbara Bonace, Jim Livengood, Clarence A. Ryan, Marcia L. Saneholtz, Samuel H. Smith
 Washington University (Missouri): Philip Godfrey, Lynn S. Imergoot, John M. Schael
 Wayne State College (Nebraska): Peter Chapman
 Wayne State University (Michigan): Robert V. Brennan, Dorothy E. Dreyer, Christ Petrouleas
 Weber State University: Jeff Livingston, Carol A. Nelson, Leland Sather, Tom Stewart
 Webster University: Betsy Alden, Daniel H. Perlman
 Wellesley College: Carolyn Campbell, Louise O'Neal
 Wentworth Institute of Technology: Lee Conrad
 Wesley College: Richard E. Szlasa
 Wesleyan University: John S. Biddiscombe, Gale Lackey
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Reginald Nealy, Cynthia E. Ryder
 West Georgia College: David L. Dugan, J. Blake Lanier
 West Liberty State College: David C. Brooks, James W. Watson
 West Texas State University: Michael Chandler, Natrelle Long, Russell C. Long, Hellon K. Wilbur
 West Virginia University: Forest Jackson Bowman, Roger C. Jeffries, Ed Pastilong
 Western Carolina University: Myron L. Coulter, Betty J. Peele, C. Claude Teagarden, Larry L. Travis
 Western Connecticut State University: Edward Farrington
 Western Illinois University: James E. McKinney, Gil Peterson, William T. Slater, Helen Smiley
 Western Kentucky University: Monnie Hankins, Pam Herriford, William G. Kummer, Louis Marciani, Thomas C. Meredith, Kelly C. Smith
 Western Maryland College: J. Richard Carpenter Jr., Carol A. Fritz
 Western Michigan University: Kathy B. Beauregard, Chauncey J. Brinn, Adrian Edwards
 Western State College of Colorado: Curt Mallory
 Westfield State College: Ronald L. Applbaum, F. Paul Bogan, Warren H. Hill
 Wheaton College (Illinois): Tony Ladd
 Wheaton College (Massachusetts): Chad Yowell
 Wheeling Jesuit College: E. F. Hall III
 Whittier College: Charles S. Adams, Sherry Calvert
 Wichita State University: Darlene Bailey, Gary Hunter, Martin M. Perline
 Widener University: Robert J. Bruce, Bruce Bryde
 Wilkes University: Philip Wingert
 William and Mary, College of: Barbara Blosser, John W. Conlee
 William Paterson College: Arthur Eason, Sabrina Grant
 William Penn College: Michael Laird
 Williams College: Robert R. Peck

Wingate College: Beth Lawrence
 Winona State University: Michael R. Herzberg, Stephen Juaire
 Winston-Salem State University: Arnold Lockett, Albert L. Roseboro
 Winthrop College: Robert H. Breakfield, Anthony J. DiGiorgio,
 Thomas N. Hickman, Steve Vacendak
 Wisconsin, University of, Eau Claire: Carol L. Klun, Stephen J.
 Kurth, Melvin Lewis, Marilyn Skrivseth
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Donald F. Harden, Daniel J.
 Spielmann
 Wisconsin, University of, La Crosse: Carol Bassuener, Bridget
 Belgiovine, Gale Grimslid, Douglas N. Hastad
 Wisconsin, University of, Madison: James Hoyt, Cheryl A. Marra,
 Pat Richter, Paul Winters
 Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Deanna D'Abbraccio, Bud K.
 Haidet, William A. Raabe
 Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: Allen F. Ackerman, John
 Kerrigan, C. Burk Tower
 Wisconsin, University of, Parkside: Linda Draft, Daryl Leonard,
 John C. Stockwell
 Wisconsin, University of, River Falls: Connie Foster, Elizabeth J.
 Oostendorp
 Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point: Frank O'Brien, Nancy Page,
 Virgil Thiesfeld
 Wisconsin, University of, Stout: Joseph Costine
 Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: Dianne Jones
 Wittenberg University: Jeff A. Ankrom, Karen R. Fellows, William
 A. Kinnison, Carl F. Schraibman
 Wofford College: Joab M. Lesesne Jr., Terri Lewitt, Daniel B.
 Morrison Jr., Gregory O'Dell
 Wooster, College of: Gordon Collins, William D. McHenry, Nan
 Nichols
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Raymond R. Gilbert, Jon C. Strauss
 Worcester State College: Susan E. Chapman
 Wright State University: Michael J. Cusack, Charles J. Hartmann,
 Paige E. Mulhollan, Peggy L. Wynkoop
 Wyoming, University of: Robert Cochran, Terri Howes, Paul L.
 Roach, Terry P. Roark, Dan Viola

Xavier University (Ohio): Jeffrey H. Fogelson, Laurie J. Massa,
 Janice B. Walker

Yale University: Barbara N. Chesler, David F. Huntington, Colleen
 Lim, Harold E. Woodsum Jr.
 Youngstown State University: Robert C. Campbell, Leslie H.
 Cochran, Joseph F. Malmisur, Pauline N. Saternow

Conference Members

Atlantic Coast Conference: Eugene F. Corrigan, Thomas P. Mickle,
 David V. Thompson, DeLores S. Todd
 Atlantic 10 Conference: Ron Bertovich, Cindy Mazda
 Big East Conference: Linda M. Bruno, Thomas McElroy, Michael A.
 Tranghese

Big Eight Conference: Prentice Gault, Carl C. James, Robyn Sharp
 Big Sky Conference: Sharon Holmberg, Ronald D. Stephenson
 Big South Conference: Carl McAloose, George F. Sasser
 Big Ten Conference: James E. Delany, Kevin Weiberg
 Big West Conference: Dennis A. Farrell, Rob Halvaks, Jody
 McRoberts, Paula Y. Smith
 California Collegiate Athletic Association: Tom D. Morgan
 Capital Athletic Conference: Joseph Gardiner
 *Centennial Conference: Steve Ulrich
 *Central Collegiate Hockey Association: Bill Beagan
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Patrick Carter, Leon G.
 Kerry, Martha Marcolini
 City University of New York Athletic Conference: Ted Hurwitz
 College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin: Jack Swartz
 Colonial Athletic Association: Kathleen Hallock, Thomas E. Yeager
 Colorado Athletic Conference: James C. Andrus
 Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Donald L. Scalf
 East Coast Conference: John B. Carpenter
 Eastern College Athletic Conference: Joseph Bertagna, Clayton W.
 Chapman, Dan Ghormley
 Empire Athletic Association: Bruce Mosberg
 *Gateway Football Conference: Patricia Viverito
 Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Thomas J. Brown
 Great Lakes Valley Conference: Kenneth A. Lindsey
 Great Midwest Conference: Michael L. Slive, Brenda R. Weare
 Gulf South Conference: Nathan N. Salant
 Indiana Collegiate Athletic Conference: William P. Robinson
 Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: John Van Why
 Ivy Group Presidents, Council of: Constance Hurlbut, Roger
 Lehecka, Jeffrey H. Orleans
 Lone Star Conference: Allen Archer, Shirley Morton, Robert Ziegler
 Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: John D. Galaris
 Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Barbara Church, Richard J.
 Ensor
 Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph McFillen, R.
 Dale Smith
 Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Sheila K. Wallace
 Kovalchik
 Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Ken B. Jones
 Mid-American Athletic Conference: Karl D. Benson, Tim Parker
 Mid-Continent Conference: Robert Brigham, Phyllis I. Holmes, Jerry
 A. Ippoliti, Jon A. Steinbrecher
 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Larry Barber, Kenneth A. Free
 Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: Michael
 Altman
 Midwest Athletic Conference for Women: Ruth E. Peterson
 Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: Harlan Knosher
 *Midwest Intercollegiate Football Conference: William L. Sylvester
 Midwestern Collegiate Conference: Bret A. Gilliland, Jonathan B.
 LeCrone

Missouri Valley Conference: J. Douglas Elgin
 New England Collegiate Conference: Joanne A. Fortunato
 New England Women's 8: Carolyn Campbell
 New Jersey Athletic Conference: Kevin McHugh
 New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association: Dolores A. Bogard
 North Atlantic Conference: Stuart P. Haskell Jr.
 North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Noel W. Olson
 North Coast Athletic Conference: Dennis M. Collins
 Northeast Conference: J. Stevens Hurlbut, Chris Monasch
 Northeast-10 Conference: Robert E. Burke
 Northern California Athletic Conference: James P. Jorgensen
 Ohio Athletic Conference: Timothy W. Gleason
 Ohio Valley Conference: R. Daniel Beebe, Ronald J. English
 Old Dominion Athletic Conference: Daniel E. Wooldridge
 Pacific-10 Conference: Thomas C. Hansen, Christine W. Hoyles, Mike Matthews, David Price
 *Pacific West Conference: Elwood B. Hahn
 Patriot League: Carl F. Ullrich
 Peach Belt Athletic Conference: Marvin Vanover
 Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference: Charles A. Eberle
 Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference: Kurt Patberg
 South Atlantic Conference: Doug Echols
 Southeastern Conference: John R. Gerdy, Roy Kramer, James L. McCullough, Sonya Varnell, Patricia W. Wall, Mark Womack
 Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph L. Amey
 Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference: Stephen P. Argo
 Southern Conference: Tom Hunnicutt, Wright Waters
 Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Cynthia R. Hill, Wallace Jackson
 Southland Conference: Bill Belknap, Tammy Broz, Don Graham, Greg Sankey
 Southwest Conference: Britton Banowsky, Fred H. Jacoby, Kyle Kallander, Kelly Krauskopf
 Southwestern Athletic Conference: James Frank, LaRita Greer, Dell Robinson
 State University of New York Athletic Conference: Patrick R. Damore, Lee Roberts
 Sun Belt Conference: Robert J. Bernardi, John Iamarino, Craig Thompson
 Sunshine State Conference: Bob Vanatta
 Trans America Athletic Conference: William C. Bibb, Ted Gumbart, Stephen E. Sturek Jr.
 University Athletic Association: Richard Rasmussen
 West Coast Conference: Michael M. Gilleran, Don Ott, Jana M. Steel
 Western Athletic Conference: Jeff Hurd, Joseph L. Kearney, Margie McDonald, Dee Menzies
 *Western Collegiate Hockey Association: Otto Breitenbach
 *Western Football Conference: Victor A. Buccola
 Wisconsin State University Conference: Virgil Thiesfled

Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Judith Kruckman
 *Yankee Conference: Albert Benson

*Nonvoting

Affiliated Members

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers: Sara N. McNabb
 American Baseball Coaches Association: Dick Bergquist, Jerry Kindall
 American Football Coaches Association: Charles McClendon
 College Football Association: Sam Baker, Mike Bohn, Charles M. Neinas
 College Sports Information Directors Association of America: Edward M. Carpenter, Fred Nuesch
 College Swimming Coaches of America, Inc.: James Richardson
 Division I-A Athletics Directors Association: Gene E. Hooks
 Golf Coaches Association of America: James H. Cook, John R. Means
 Intercollegiate Women's Lacrosse Coaches Association: Dee McDonough
 Metropolitan Intercollegiate Basketball Association: John J. Powers
 Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic: John F. Cauley, Joseph M. O'Brien, John W. O'Donnell, William C. Sullivan
 National Association of Basketball Coaches: Carol Haney, James Haney
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary, Matt Wolfert
 National Football Officials Alliance: Jim Campbell, Tommy Taylor, Bob Welch
 National Softball Coaches Association: Rayla Allison
 NCAA Division I Track and Field Coaches Association: Gary K. Schwartz
 U.S. Fencing Coaches Association: Alfred Peredo
 U.S. Olympic Committee: Charles Davis, Curt L. Hamakawa, Patricia A. Sabo
 USA Basketball: Warren S. Brown
 Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Anne E. Flannery, Betty Jaynes
 Women's Intercollegiate Cross Country Coaches Association: Louis J. Duesing Jr.

Corresponding Members

Apprentice School, Newport News Shipbuilding: William G. Casto
 Hawaii, University of, Hilo: Edward J. Kormondy, William Trumbo
 Indiana University-Purdue University of Indianapolis: Eugene R. Tempel, Hugh A. Wolf
 Lane College: Lucious L. Daily Jr.
 Oral Roberts University: Robert T. Brooks

Pratt Institute: Eugene Marshall Jr.
Wesleyan College (Georgia): Boyd Schoeller

Visitors

Agnes Scott College: Cathy Benton, Gue Hudson, Cindy Peterson
Alderson-Broadbudd College: Allen M. Cassell
Alvernia College: Sandra Slabik
American Association of State Colleges and Universities: James B. Appleberry
American College Testing: John Harrison
American Council on Education: Sheldon E. Steinbach
Andrus Group, The: Sharon Andrus
Barton College: Gary Hall
Beaver College: Linda Detra, Shirley Liddle
Belmont Abbey College: Michael P. Reidy
Bluefield State College: John S. Duffy
Bond, Schoeneck & King: Richard J. Evrard, Kathy Jones
Burgess, Robert
Bonner, Francis W.
Charleston, University of (West Virginia): Edwin H. Welch
Coker College: Ed S. Clark
Conord College: Ron Burgher
Eastern College: Wayne Rasmussen
Endicott College: Stephen L. Woodcock
Fairmont State College: Colin Cameron
Fairtron Corporation: Ken Krogman
Fleishman-Hillard, Inc.: Jonelle Birney
Franklin, Tim
Glennville State College: Steve Creasey, Kenneth W. Osborne
Harvey & Associates: James Harvey
Hilton Hotels Corporation: Patty Stevens
Kazmaier Associates: Richard Kazmaier
Kennesaw State College: Dave Waples
Knight Commission on Athletics: Creed Black, Maureen E. Devlin, John Griffin, Christopher B. Morris
Knoxville College: Joseph Redmond, John B. Turner
Liberty Bowl Football Classic: A. F. Dudley
Meadowlands Sports Complex: Michael Graime, Helen Strus
Milwaukee School of Engineering: Bob Peterson
Minnesota, University of, Morris: Mark Fohl
Molton, Allen & Williams Corporation: William M. Jacka
Moorhead State University: Mel Schmitz, Katy Wilson
Mount Olive College: Willis A. Brown
National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges: C. Peter Magrath
NCAA International: Terry Driscoll
NCAA Presidents Commission: Wilford S. Bailey, Bernard F. Sliger
Northern State University (South Dakota): Jim Kretchman
Oahu Travel Inc.: Pam Goodman
Pasadena Tournament of Roses: Bob Cheney, Harriman Cronk, Jack French, Gary Hayward, Fred Johnson, Fred W. Soldwedel, Mike Ward

Pellettieri, Rabstein and Altman: Melvin S. Narol
St. Andrews Presbyterian College: Lorenzo Canalis
St. Francis, College of (Illinois): John Orr, Pat Sullivan
Salem-Teikyo University: Ronald E. Ohl, Lou Talerico
Santa Monica College: Glenn Bruce Smith
Sara Lee Corporation: Joselyn Williams
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools: James T. Rogers
Southwest State University (Minnesota): Gary Buer, Debbie J. Denbeck
Sports Perspectives International: Charles S. Farrell, Bennie L. Turner
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey: Michael Scott
Tarleton State University: Jim Johnson, Dennis P. McCabe, Ron Newsome
Tele Planning International, Inc.: Masaru Yanaka
U.S. House of Representatives: Congresswoman Cardiss Collins, David Schooler
Victorian Basketball Association: Megan Brideson
Wayland Baptist University: Greg Feris
West Virginia Institute of Technology: Robert P. Simile
West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Barry Blizzard
West Virginia State College: Gregory K. P. Smith
West Virginia Wesleyan College: George A. Klebez
Wyatt & Associates: Sherri L. Wyatt

Working News Media

ABC News: Ken Dana, Steve Narisi, Chuck Pharis
Akron Beacon Journal: Tom Giffen
Amusement Business: Linda Deckard
Associated Press: Bill Janscha, David Phillips, Arnie Stapleton, Pat Sullivan, Doug Tucker
Atlanta Journal-Constitution: Tony Barnhart
Austin American-Statesman: Kirk Bohls, Rick Cantu
Baton Rouge Advocate: Dave Moorman
Boston Globe: Mark Blaudschun
Bradley Photography: Jim Bradley
CBS Radio Sports: David Kurman, Frank Murphy
CBS Sports: Len DeLuca
Charlotte Observer: Liz Clarke
Chicago Tribune: Andy Bagnato, Ed Sherman
Chronicle of Higher Education: Debra Blum, Jim Fiscus, Doug Lederman
Dallas Morning News: Doug Bedell, Ivan Maisel, David McNabb, Darryl Richards, Steve Richardson
Davis Enterprise: Dan Langendorf
Dayton Daily News: Ritter Collett
Des Moines Register: Buck Turnbull
Detroit Free Press: Steve Kornacki
Detroit News: Fred Girard
Durham Herald Sun: Bill Brill

ESPN: Mike Aresco, Dave Brown
 Fort Worth Star-Telegram: Jimmy Burch, Whit Canning
 Greg Echlin Sports Service: Greg Echlin
 Hickman Voice: Don Bryant
 Houston Chronicle: Jonathan Feigen
 Houston Post: Jim Molony
 Huntsville Times: John Pruett
 Kansas City Star: Adam Teicher
 KRLD: Craig Miller
 KVIL Radio: Kristi Scales, Brad Sham
 Los Angeles Times: Bill Dwyre, Danny Robbins
 Mississippi Syndicated Columnist: Jimmie McDowell
 Missouri Columbian: Kent Lawrence
 New Orleans Times Picayune: Larry McMillen
 New York Times: Bill Rhoden
 Omaha World-Herald: Dennis Dodd
 Oregonian: Ken Goe
 Raleigh News & Observer: Chip Alexander
 Raycom Management Group: Chris Boulton, Terry Hanson
 Raycom Sports Inc.: Ken Haines, Joel Lewin, Rick Ray, Chuck Steedman
 Richmond Times-Dispatch: Jerry Lindquist
 St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Dave Dorr
 Scripps Howard News Service: Tom O'Toole
 SportSouth Network: Bill Irish
 Tucson Citizen: Corky Simpson
 Turner Sports: John D. Vandegrift
 United Press International: Mike Barnes
 USA Today: Debbie Becker, Steve Wieberg
 Waco Tribune Herald: Dave Campbell
 Washington Post: Steve Berkowitz

87th Annual Convention Opening Business Session

Wednesday Afternoon, January 13, 1993

The 87th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, meeting at the Loews Anatole Hotel, Dallas, Texas, was called to order at 4:30 p.m., with President Judith M. Sweet, director of athletics, University of California, San Diego, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

President Sweet: If I may have your attention, please. I would like to call this session to order. It is my pleasure to welcome you to Dallas and the 87th NCAA annual Convention.

During the next few days, through healthy discussion and debate, we have the opportunity to make intercollegiate athletics better than it might otherwise be. As we continue our commitment to reform in intercollegiate athletics, we might note that yesterday represents experience, tomorrow represents hope, today presents the opportunity of getting from one to the other in the best way possible. As we assess our current status and resolve to build a stronger foundation, we can look to a brighter future.

It is my responsibility to review certain Convention procedures and announcements. Our meetings are conducted under the procedures prescribed by Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. We are assisted in that regard by our parliamentarian, former NCAA President Alan Chapman of Rice University. One such procedure is the need to adopt the Convention Program before beginning our business. I now will ask for a motion to adopt the printed program of this Convention so we may proceed.

George W. Schubert (University of North Dakota): I move the delegates adopt the printed program of this Convention.

[The motion was seconded and the Convention Program was adopted.]

President Sweet: Robert's Rules of Order provides that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such procedures. They are reviewed in the introductory section of your Convention Notice. NCAA Convention procedures are designed to assure fairness and equitable treatment for all members, eliminate questions of propriety and expedite your work as delegates. I will not take the time to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to assure fairness. I remind delegates that the chair fully intends to apply those procedures throughout. There are certain procedures we employ in attempting to use our time efficiently.

In all of the business sessions, the chair will attempt to "eyeball" as many votes as possible, calling for a count by the Voting Committee only when there is doubt as to the majority. I ask delegates to refrain from calling for a vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue. If a count is taken, we will use the electronic voting equipment, but only vote totals will be recorded, not institutional positions. On bylaw issues in the general business session, the chair will call for the vote in the same division sequence each time: Division I first, then Division II and then Division III. The result of a division's vote will not be announced until all divisions have voted. Please remember that NCAA procedures require all votes to be by paddle, or roll call when indicated, and not by voice or show of hands.

Let me also review briefly the "window of reconsideration" opportunity. In the general business session Thursday afternoon, I will call for any motions to reconsider anything adopted by the division business sessions that morning. That will be the only time that a division decision from its separate session can be reconsidered in the general business session. We will repeat that "window" Saturday morning for reconsideration of any division votes taken Friday. All reconsideration motions involving actions in the division business sessions must occur either in those division sessions or in that "window of reconsideration" pertaining to those sessions.

CONVENTION COMMITTEES

President Sweet: It now is my privilege to identify the Convention committees and the chair of each. The Nominating Committee, Charles Cavagnaro, Memphis State University; the Men's Committee on Committees, James W. Vick, University of Texas at Austin; the Women's Committee on Committees, Peggy J. Pruitt, Ohio University; the Voting Committee, Kathy Noble, University of Montana; the Credentials Committee, Michael M. Gilleran, West Coast Conference, and the Memorial Resolutions Committee, Catherine C. Haker, College of St. Rose.

In accordance with NCAA procedures, sports committee and general committee reports are not presented orally but are included in NCAA Annual Reports, which is available at the registration desk for each member institution and member conference. The secretary-treasurer and Executive Committee reports also appear in the Annual Reports. At the beginning of the general business session Saturday morning, we will entertain motions to receive and approve those reports.

REPORT OF COUNCIL

President Sweet: We now move to the Council report for 1992. To present that report, I am pleased to introduce a Council member whose term is ending with this Convention. He has been a valuable Council member and is the first director of athletics to represent his conference on the Council. He served seven years on the Division I Men's Basketball Committee and is a past president of the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics. It particularly is fit-

ting, I think, that we ask a Texan to present the Council here in Dallas. I am honored to present to you the athletic report of Texas Christian University, Frank Windegger.

Frank Windegger (Texas Christian University): President and members of the Association, I am privileged to present to you the Council report. This report is mandated by the NCAA Constitution. It tends to be rather straightforward and routine in nature. There are things that need to be stated as a matter of record. At the end of those comments, I will offer a couple of my own observations.

At this time, the membership has the opportunity to challenge any Council actions of the past year. My presentation is a summary. I will make reference to the sections of the full Council report as I proceed. First, The NCAA News publishes minutes of each Council meeting, thus informing you in timely fashion of all Council actions. In 1992, those minutes appeared in the following issues of The NCAA News: February 19, May 20, September 14 and November 23.

Second, NCAA Annual Reports contains the abridged minutes of the past year's Council meetings. That book is distributed here and also is mailed to each NCAA member. In those two places you will find every Council action of the past year. When the general business session begins tomorrow afternoon, there will be a motion to accept and approve the Council's full report. That will be your opportunity to challenge any of these actions.

The next procedural aspect of this report is to call attention to certain legislative actions taken by the Council. I refer you to the four appendices in the Official Notice. First, Appendix C of the notice sets forth the interpretations that the Legislative Review Committee intends to include in the next NCAA Manual. All of these have been approved by the Council. At the beginning of Appendix C is the procedure for accepting or challenging the inclusion of any of those interpretations in the Manual. If you don't want any one of those included in the Manual, now is the time to object. Second, Appendix D gives you the noncontroversial amendments that the Council adopted in 1992. The Council has the authority to take these noncontroversial actions between Conventions. Once again, acceptance of or a challenge to any of these actions occurs at this point. Does any delegate wish to object to any of the actions in Appendix D? Third, Appendix E contains cases in which the Council has modified the wording in the Manual based on review of the Legislation's original intent. Does any delegate object to these actions? Finally, Appendix F sets forth changes made by the Council during the past year in the enforcement procedures. If any delegate objects to any of those, now is the time to say so.

That concludes the procedural features of this report. Among the Council's other major involvements during the past year, I should note the work done on the athletics certification program for Division I, as set forth in Proposal No. 15. That is a major step forward in assisting our institutions with rules compliance.

I also want to mention that we have spent time on enforcement issues, reviewing the recommendations of the Committee on Infractions and of President Rex Lee's special committee, which worked so

dithe
ful
2-

diligently in that area. Both of those committees deserve our praise for their sincere efforts to improve the enforcement and infractions process. That work is ongoing through an ad hoc committee formed by the Council and the Presidents Commission.

I want to emphasize the continuing cooperative relationship between the Presidents Commission and the Council. It is important to recognize that the Commission's major legislative initiatives this year came for the most part from the recommendations of joint committees—the Council's special committee on legislative procedures and the Commission's subcommittee on the role and authority of the Commission. These are cooperative endeavors, as have been most of the Presidents Commission's efforts in the past several years.

The Commission also deserves our thanks for identifying in its strategic plan several major areas now being studied for future action—financial conditions in college athletics, student-athlete welfare and ethical conduct and sportsmanship. The Council and the Commission are closely watching the work of the Gender-Equity Task Force. You will have a status report on that topic this afternoon.

Much of the Council's time is spent on interpretations, legislation, membership petitions and waivers, various Committee reports, and the other types of activity necessary in the effective oversight of the Association's affairs between Conventions. Those matters all are reflected in the printed minutes that I referenced previously.

Now, if you will indulge me for a few more moments, I want to offer a few of my own comments. First, I would be remiss if I did not recognize on behalf of all Council members the outstanding leadership provided by our president for the past two years. I do not believe that the Association could have had a better person in that office during these busy and demanding years. Judy Sweet has given us magnificent direction. She runs an excellent meeting, she represents the Association wonderfully in various public forums and she is as adept at consensus-building as anyone I have seen in this business. I believe we all owe a very large debt of gratitude to Judy Sweet. (Applause)

Finally, I want to express my appreciation for the opportunity to serve on the Council for the past four years. My conference has a long and distinguished history of service and leadership in the NCAA. I am proud to have been able to serve my conference on the Council. As I leave the Council, I want to emphasize one major theme. That theme is cooperation. What the Council, the Presidents Commission and the NCAA have accomplished in the past three years all have come about because of cooperation. The Council and the Presidents Commission have achieved a very cooperative relationship that has both set the tone and provided the necessary leadership for the successful reform movement in college athletics.

This year we have seen a cooperative attempt involving the Council, the Commission, the Knight Foundation Commission and the Southern Association of Conferences and Schools to develop a workable and effective certification program for Division I institutions. We have seen the Committee on Infractions, the Special Committee

to Review the NCAA Enforcement and Infractions Process, the Council and the Commission engage in a cooperative and respectful effort to address necessary changes in the enforcement process despite some strong support for one approach or another. Anyone who has been paying attention realizes that there is an ever-increasing level of cooperation between the athletics directors and the presidents in terms of desired reforms in college athletics.

There are those who do not want to see that cooperative approach. There are those who want to create dissension and disagreement and discord in college athletics. There are those who want to create a battle between the athletics community and the presidents. There are those who do not want to see reforms in college athletics. There are those who do not believe we will work together if the dollar sign grows large enough or if someone screams loudly enough. There are those who believe selfish interests in athletics always will overcome the overall welfare of the member colleges and universities and the welfare of college athletics in general.

I hope that is not true. I do not believe it is true. We have many problems in this business. We will be successful in addressing them only if everyone works together to seek solutions. I hope you will think about that. President Sweet, that concludes my report of the Council for 1992. (Applause)

President Sweet: Thank you, Frank, for an excellent report and thank you for all the good work that you have done during your tenure on the Council. It has meant a lot.

We now turn to one of the major current issues in college athletics—gender equity. We are going to hear a status report on the work of the NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force. I had planned to introduce the cochair of that task force—Phyllis L. Howlett, assistant commissioner of the Big Ten Conference, and James J. Whalen, president of Ithaca College. Unfortunately, due to a death in the family, Phyllis cannot be with us. But President Whalen has very graciously agreed on behalf of the two cochair to present that report.

REPORT OF NCAA GENDER-EQUITY TASK FORCE

James J. Whalen (Ithaca College): Thank you very much, Judy. I will try to be reasonably articulate and reasonably brief.

As most of you know, Judy is serving as a consultant to the task force and I want to express our appreciation for her good counsel and support throughout these months. I also would like to recognize other task force members who may be present. If they would just stand for a moment. In the event that you disagree with what I have to say, please attack the committee member nearest you. (Laughter)

As Judy mentioned, my cochair, Phyllis Howlett, could not be with us due to a death in the family. We had planned to present this report together and I know Phyllis very much wanted to be here to participate. In her absence, I will make the report an overview of the task force activities and plans.

At the outset, I want to emphasize two things. First, as has been the case with so many of the issues the NCAA has addressed in recent years, this issue of gender equity is tremendously complex. We

should not look for any easy or fast answers. I have been concerned from the outset, as has Phyllis, by the degree of volatility that this matter has produced. There seems to be a great deal of anger, feelings of threat, fear, one might even go so far as to say paranoia. If we are going to come up with reasonable and productive resolutions to this long-standing concern, we have to rise above the volatility and work together.

That brings me to the second point. Perhaps more than ever before we need serious commitment and leadership in support of this effort. Of all the committees I have chaired or cochaired, this one is by far the most diverse in its makeup. Participants represent enormously divergent views. There is a reason for this. It is important to have input from all perspectives. This is not just a divisional issue, not just a monetary issue, not just a sports-specific issue. It is in many ways one of the most all-encompassing matters with which the NCAA may be involved in and one that in my view is as important to men as it is to women. We will not get anywhere without leadership from all, especially from presidents, athletic directors and coaches.

I also want you to remember that this is just the beginning of the discussion. No decisions will be made until there is an opportunity for the membership to consider and react to proposals the task force may generate. There is much work to be done. You must feel free to get your views in at any point. We need your considered and constructive input.

As you know, the NCAA completed a study of issues related to gender equity in March 1992. The results indicated an imbalance in the application of resources in intercollegiate athletics based on gender. For example, men's teams received almost 70 percent of athletics scholarship dollars, 77 percent of operating dollars and 83 percent of the funds available for recruiting. All of this in spite of the fact that overall enrollment in colleges and universities on the average was almost evenly split between men and women. These results led the NCAA to appoint a task force to study and address the issue. Dick Schultz called together a group of 23, including 16 appointed members and seven consultants. The group includes chief executive officers, coaches, athletics directors, attorneys, athletics conference and association representatives, and legislators among others. Our charge is to develop a definition of gender equity, to review current NCAA practices—especially legislation and championships to determine their impact on gender-equity matters—and finally, to propose a set of principles that could guide improvement and provide benchmarks to measure our progress over time.

The task force has met three times. Our first initiative was to define a basic principle that would guide our deliberations. We chose on a preliminary basis to simply reaffirm policies of the Association that should assert the value of equitable participation and treatment of men and women in intercollegiate athletics. Other groups such as the Presidents Commission, the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics and the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators also have produced statements of principles that have proven to be very helpful to our discussions. They are good presentations and we undoubtedly will incorporate several of the

thoughts and ideas shared by these organizations as we develop our final proposals.

We further determined that in order to focus adequate attention on several matters that we should divide the task force into subcommittees. Consequently, we have two subcommittees, the first of which is chaired by Carla H. Hay of Marquette University. This group is examining institutional standards that so far have included participation ratios and different approaches related to football. This group also has developed a draft survey designed to gather information about strategies for promoting gender equity that have proven successful on various campuses. They will continue their work on the draft and soon will be sending a final version to the membership.

The other subcommittee is chaired by Charlotte West of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. This group is examining the impact of existing NCAA practices on gender equity, which thus far has included discussion of NCAA committee structure and championship programs. With regard to the latter, I want to acknowledge the work of the Executive Committee, which was reported in the December 16 issue of *The NCAA News*. We obviously will be taking its proposals into account as we continue our work.

Our next meeting is after this Convention. We plan to meet on a monthly basis. The subcommittee on institutional standards will be turning its attention to such matters as facility usage, financial resources, participation opportunities, personnel hiring practices, senior women administrators, scheduling competition and support services.

The subcommittee on NCAA practices will be talking about conference grants, legislation, NCAA personnel hiring practices and revenue distribution. The task force as a whole will be addressing the broader questions that impact gender equity, such as the role of revenue production, the role of football and the fundamental matters of fairness. We recognize that football is an important issue. All of this material will be brought together by the full task force as it works to develop final recommendations for consideration by the Association.

With regard to this Convention, I should note that the task force reviewed 20 of the proposals under consideration. We determined not to take a position one way or the other on most of them at this time. This includes proposals about certification. We certainly support the notion that the commitment to equity should be a part of any certification process and we look forward to the Association's discussion of this legislation.

There are six proposals that we feel have a direct bearing on matters of gender equity and for which we wanted to express our support. They are Proposal No. 11 on permissible expenses; Proposal No. 27 on grants-in-aid limits in Division I women's sports; Proposal No. 28 on grants-in-aid limits in women's basketball; Proposal No. 136 on minimum sports-sponsorship requirements in Division I; Proposal No. 149 on the establishment of a principle of nondiscrimination, and Proposal No. 152 on championship-sponsorship criteria for 1994-95.

I expect that many of you think that much of what I have shared with you sounds somewhat vague. There are no concrete answers at

this point. That brings me back to my original point. This is the beginning of a discussion of a very complex, important and serious issue, one that has bearing on virtually every aspect of intercollegiate athletics. Before we suggest specific directions, we must do our homework and allow for ample discussion of various views. I want to assure you on behalf of the task force that we are pledged to fulfill our charge in a timely but not precipitous way in presenting recommendations. There will be hearings before we make a final report. I urge you to participate in those.

Ultimately, it will be up to you, the membership, to decide whether to accept or to implement those recommendations, to act on them legislatively or to expand or modify them. In any case, I ask you on behalf of the task force for your support in this important endeavor. Help us set aside individual fears and agendas and work to find reasonable answers that will best serve the overall interest of the men and women who participate in intercollegiate athletics.

Let me add that I consider the NCAA to be not just an athletics organization. It is an educational organization as well. The men and women who participate in the NCAA are just as much educators as they are directors of athletics and coaches. That is very important. I ask for your help. Phyllis and I will work hard with our committee members, who have been absolutely marvelous. I have enjoyed working with them and I look forward to another couple of months, not years. In a few months, we will have something for you. Thank you very much. (Applause)

REPORT OF MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

President Sweet: At this point in the agenda, we will have the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. I would like to ask delegates and our friends in the media to please remain silent during the reading of the memorial resolutions.

Catherine C. Haker (College of St. Rose): President Sweet and delegates, at this time I would like to recognize the other members of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. They are Allen F. Ackerman, the University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, and Judy W. Rose, University of North Carolina, Charlotte.

The following is a list of men and women who have passed away during the past year:

Jeff Anderson, Eastern Connecticut State University
 Everett M. Bailey Sr., Ursinus College
 Wilson Bell, Virginia Polytechnic Institute
 Al Brightman, Seattle University
 Iris Brown, Norfolk State University
 Robert N. Brown, West Virginia University
 Tom Cahill, U.S. Military Academy
 Howard Cann, New York University
 Frank F. Carideo, Mississippi State University
 Keith Caywood, Emporia State University
 James T. Chambers, Howard University
 John Cherberg, University of Washington
 Irvin Christenson, Concordia College, Moorhead

Jacobi Christianson, Concordia College, Moorhead
 Vandy Christie, Northwestern University
 George Chryst, University of Wisconsin, Platteville
 John J. Clune, U.S. Air Force Academy
 Bob Commings, University of Iowa
 John Compton, St. Norbert College
 Edward A. Coray, Wheaton College (Illinois)
 Brian E. Cox, University of Maine
 Max Crowder, Duke University
 Ted Dailey, Syracuse University
 Hugh Devore, University of Notre Dame
 Whitey Dovel, University of Maryland, College Park
 John Dromo, University of Louisville
 Don Ficco, Villanova University
 Harry H. Fouke, University of Houston
 Edmund J. Franco, Fordham University
 Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton
 Herbert W. Gallagher, Northeastern University
 Kenneth Gardner, Northeast Missouri State University
 Daniel Gazzilli, Utica College
 Freddy A. Godart, National Intercollegiate Soccer Officials

Association (Virginia Chapter)

Jack S. Gray, University of Texas at Austin
 Frank Griffin, Western Kentucky University
 Henry Hawkins, Texas Southern University
 Joseph F. Healey, New York University
 Rev. Timothy S. Healy, Georgetown University
 Gilbert J. Heard, Northern Michigan University
 Mel Hein, University of Southern California
 Robert W. Hicklin, Erskine College
 Paul D. Hinkle, Butler University
 Henry P. Iba, Oklahoma State University
 James Inman, Hillsdale College
 Robert J. Kane, Cornell University
 Tim Kerin, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 Joseph Keyser, State University College at Fredonia
 Walter Kichelski, University of Miami (Florida)
 Edward W. Krause, University of Notre Dame
 Green Laird, Virginia Polytechnic Institute
 Arthur Lawrence, Union College (New York)
 Karl J. Lawrence, Colgate University
 Jeanette A. Lee, St. Paul's College
 Arthur Loche, Florida Institute of Technology
 Bob Macken, Fordham University
 Morris Mason, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
 Joseph W. McDonough, College of the Holy Cross
 John McKenna, Youngstown State University
 Bob McNulty, Rutgers University, New Brunswick
 Laura Moynihan, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
 Bill Nicholas, Tournament of Roses
 John O'Hara, University of Iowa

Ray Oosting, Trinity College (Connecticut)
 Frank Patrick, Pennsylvania State University
 Paul E. Patten, St. Lawrence University
 Kenneth Perrone, St. John's University (New York)
 Doyt Perry, Bowling Green State University
 Tom Pugliese, Georgia State University
 William C. Putnam, University of California, Los Angeles
 Ciney Rech, University of Missouri, St. Louis
 Emil G. Reitz, Loyola College (Maryland)
 Ray C. Robison, Arizona State University
 Marshall W. Ryman, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
 James V. Sabatelle, Pennsylvania State University
 Joe Sapor, City College of New York
 Frances Schaafsma, California State University, Long Beach
 Lester J. Schloen, St. John's University (New York)
 Field Scovell, Cotton Bowl
 Moses Sharpe, Johnson C. Smith University
 George Sherman, Wayne State University (Michigan)
 C. M. Smith, University of Mississippi
 Albert Snyder, Lehigh University
 Larry Steele, State University of New York at Buffalo
 William D. Stringer, University of Iowa
 Hugh W. Taylor, Arkansas State University
 James M. Thompson, Howard University
 John Trombino, Fordham University
 James A. Van Fleet, University of Florida
 Fred Vescolani, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 John Vitone, University of Rochester
 Billy Willingham, University of Houston
 Earl Wilson, Clark Atlanta University
 John Winnie, University of Iowa
 Alexander J. Yunevich, Alfred University

Please stand and observe a moment of silence for those who have gone before us. Thank you.

If you know of persons who should be added to the list, please contact a member of this committee or a member of the national office staff.

President Sweet: As we conclude our opening session, we come to one of the highlights of our annual Convention—the state of the Association address by our executive director. I am very pleased to introduce Executive Director Dick Schultz. (Applause)

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

Richard D. Schultz: Madam President and delegates to the 1993 NCAA Convention, let me also add my welcome to those already extended as we prepare for the 87th annual Convention. When we sat down, Alan Chapman gave me a bit of trivia. I am not dating Alan back to 1906, but he noted that this is certainly a difference from that first NCAA Convention, at which 18 people were in attendance.

I also would like to take this opportunity, because it might be my only opportunity to do so publicly, to just offer to Judy Sweet my

thanks and that of the staff. Judy, you have been fantastic. You have been a terrific leader and we can't thank you enough for the leadership you have provided these past two years. (Applause)

Today, I would like to reflect on the recent accomplishments of the Association, review some particular pieces of legislation that you will be considering this week, and outline what I believe to be the major challenges we face.

It was in this ballroom in 1990 that I challenged our Association to create a new model for intercollegiate athletics. I said then that it is time for us to take stock of what we had created—save the positives, rid ourselves of the negatives and develop a new approach for athletics—one that places athletics in perspective and allows it to be a vital, honorable part of higher education.

The reasons for that challenge were numerous. But the most compelling reason was the public perception of intercollegiate athletics in 1990. In 1989, a Harris poll indicated that 78 percent of the general public as well as our institutions and faculties perceived athletics to be out of control. I am pleased to note that in January 1993, three years later, through the efforts of the Presidents Commission, NCAA Council, the Knight Commission and many in this room, we are well on our way in building this new model.

Your efforts have not gone unnoticed. A follow-up Harris poll to the 1989 poll, which was conducted in early 1992, indicates that the percentage of the general public and faculties that feel athletics is out of control has been reduced from 78 percent to 47 percent. That remarkable 31-point decline is a tribute to your work. The 47-percent figure is an indication of the work to be done.

In my opinion, this Convention is poised to make another enormous, positive stride by the passage of the athletics certification plan. Without a doubt, some time ago, there was some concern about athletics certification. About the size, enormity and amount of time taken by the study, the potential cost of certification to this Association and to you as individual members, and the potential redundancy with certification that was going on with some of the accrediting associations. I am pleased to report to you that, through a terrific effort by a committee headed by Joe Crowley, that those concerns have been dealt with. They have done a great job of simplifying and reducing the size of that self-study. They have simplified it to the point where I think it can be safely said that a certification self-study will take absolutely no more time than the institutional self-study now mandated once every five years, if you do that five-year self-study in a conscientious way. And the redundancy issue, especially with the Southern Accrediting Association, has been worked out to where that has been minimized and really is not a factor when considering certification.

I urge your strong support in passing this legislation so that it can go into effect in the very near future. While there are other improvements to be made, including an ongoing attempt to ensure quality and integrity in intercollegiate athletics, I believe that with the passing of certification, we will have unequivocally demonstrated that the reform movement is firmly entrenched.

Having demonstrated our resolve, we should not shy away from changing or modifying reform legislation if it is not doing what it was intended to do. If adjustments are made to previous reform legislation, let's not take the position that we are sliding backward, or falling off the sled, but only refining and improving legislation that has gone before it.

While certification is clearly the most important agenda item at this Convention, there are several others that I would like to discuss with you. Proposal No. 17 deals with an initial-eligibility clearinghouse. I would like to clarify for you some misconceptions about that proposal. This legislation is coming forward because of a resolution that came from the membership in 1992 asking the Council to come forward at this Convention with legislation creating a national clearinghouse. There has been some misunderstanding as to what the cost of this will be to the Association. If this legislation passes, we will complete our negotiations with ACT to handle the clearinghouse operations. I have confidence that the cost to the Association will not exceed \$500,000 a year, and when you consider that will provide service to approximately 500 of our institutions, the cost is relatively small. We are looking at a cost in the range of \$20 to \$23 per certification. It is the intent of the Council that a student-athlete would pay \$15 to \$18 of this and the balance (\$5) would be paid by the Association.

The same fee exemption would be in place for the needy student-athlete as is now applied to either the SAT or ACT; in other words, if a needy student-athlete qualifies for a fee exemption in either of the standardized tests, the athlete will also qualify for an exemption regarding certification. It is the feeling by those who support this legislation that it will add a new element of credibility and consistency to the initial-eligibility process and, in the long run, will speed up rather than slow down the process once the database is put together.

This legislation is not a request coming from the NCAA staff. The passage of this legislation will neither help nor hinder the staff. The workload of determining initial eligibility will remain the same for us—that of dealing with any disputes regarding core curriculum.

Proposal No. 50 deals with a joint policy board. This board would be made up of the Administrative Committee, which consists of the five officers of the Association and the executive director, and the four members of the executive committee of the Presidents Commission. This group would have the ability to review and concur on the Association's budget, legislative process and agenda, and the evaluation and supervision of the executive director. In addition to assuring that the Presidents Commission is included in all of the major activities of the Association, this legislation responds directly to those who have said that the presidents cannot control intercollegiate athletics if they don't control the Association's budget. Passing this legislation will ensure that that takes place.

Proposal No. 53 calls for the establishment of an administrative review panel and is in direct response to my call to this Convention last year to provide more flexibility in dealing with special cases regarding student-athletes. The passage of this proposal would estab-

lish a panel that could review appeals by member institutions of decisions made by an NCAA committee, with the exception of the Eligibility Committee and the Committee on Infractions. In addition, it could provide relief when legislation prevents the Council from taking an appropriate action in individual cases. This legislation is very important because it does guarantee more flexibility and provides the opportunity to make common-sense decisions in particular cases.

Proposal Nos. 54 and 55 also are very important. No. 54 would provide two additional members to the Committee on Infractions, and it would specify that these two additional slots should be filled by members of the general public. As you may recall, one of the recommendations of the Special Committee to Review the Enforcement and Infractions Process was the introduction of independent fact-finders. The makeup of members on this committee would have that type of background and would add diversity to the Committee on Infractions.

Proposal No. 55, recommended by the Committee on Infractions, responds to an issue that also was reviewed by the aforementioned special committee—that is, the establishment of an infractions appeals committee. At the present time, all appeals are handled by the appropriate steering committee of the NCAA Council. This proposal establishes a separate infractions appeals committee, replacing the steering committees, further strengthening the due process elements of our procedures.

There also are a number of proposals that deal with the welfare of the student-athlete, and I am hopeful that these will get very strong support. We need to be alert to the changing needs and activities of our student-athletes and provide a means for their views to be heard. Our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, which is in attendance at this Convention, is in the process of sponsoring a survey to be sent to all campuses immediately after the Convention to determine the type of student advisory committees that you may have at your institutions.

The committee believes, and I strongly support its belief, that our student-athletes need a clear and more significant voice at the institutional level. A committee of this type on each campus would aid in this effort. During my travels to various campuses, I have met with several of these committees that are already in place and I have found them to be very efficient and a very important part of the intercollegiate program at those institutions. We all need to make a concerted effort to obtain input and ideas from student-athletes to assure that we are responding to their needs. The importance of this issue has been recognized by the Presidents Commission, which has made the welfare of student-athletes a central part of its strategic plan.

Last year, I introduced to this Convention the concept of federating our rules on a sport-by-sport basis. This has received a lot of positive response. Because of this, the Recruiting Committee will be seeking input from coaches with an eye to developing recruiting rules on a sport-by-sport basis. In addition, the Legislative Review Committee will be focusing this year on ways to deregulate Bylaw

13, the recruiting bylaw, and hopes to present a package of proposals to the Council for possible sponsorship at the 1994 Convention. The committee will be seeking input from various constituencies within the Association. These efforts are important and need your support if we hope to simplify and make our regulations more user-friendly.

One final comment regarding legislation: The NCAA legislative services and data-processing staffs have been working to develop an enhanced legislative services database, which the membership can subscribe to. The new database currently is being used in the interpretations booth at this Convention. It is being tested by the Legislative Review Committee and selected individuals in conference offices and on campuses. It will be available early this year. The database is a resource tool for member institutions so they can access by computer the NCAA Manual, as well as staff and official interpretations and legislative assistance columns.

A year ago at this time we were facing numerous political challenges at both the state and national level. In fact, a year ago, 11 states had on the docket some type of due process legislation aimed at restricting or eliminating the NCAA's ability to process infractions cases in those states.

I am pleased to report that through the efforts of many, including many of you in the membership, we have been able to stop or eliminate legislation in all of those states. We also were faced with some very far-reaching national legislation that would have greatly affected your ability to govern your individual athletics programs. I also am pleased to say that legislation did not go forward, and I don't anticipate it being reintroduced in the next Congress.

That does not mean that we have eliminated all of our political challenges. There still will be the interest on the part of several congressmen and women to continue to observe the activities of the NCAA and perhaps introduce legislation during this session. At the same time, we are closely monitoring what is going on in the states and hope to be able to continue our proactive policies in dealing with state legislation.

In my address last year, I focused on four pressures, one of which was the financial pressures facing higher education and intercollegiate athletics today. That pressure is still with us and will be for some time to come. As you are aware, the Presidents Commission has appointed a committee to review the financial conditions in intercollegiate athletics and report back to it early this year. From that, the Commission will determine whether any new legislation should come forward in 1994 to help reduce costs on the national level. Personally, I hope we can deal with these concerns locally and at the conference level and propose national legislation only as a last recourse.

On a more positive note, I hope that you were pleasantly surprised with the bonus distribution that was declared by the Executive Committee in December. Three million new dollars have been distributed back to our Division I members because of excess revenue. I think it is important that you understand where that money came from. Our income was right on target as budgeted, but \$3.6 million was saved

out of this year's budget through the efforts of a number of people. More than \$1 million came by reducing the national office expenditures. This was a concentrated effort made by all of our staff members to reduce office expenses so that we could return more dollars to the membership. The balance of that \$3.6 million was saved through cost-containment efforts in the management of other membership programs and services.

This also might be an appropriate time to try to separate some fact from fiction regarding the national office staff and how the business of the Association is conducted. I still occasionally hear concerns raised by people who have the perception that the national office staff is constantly expanding and spending freely while member institutions are hurting financially. I hope I can put that rumor to rest quite quickly. For more than two years, we have had a staff hiring freeze and have not added staff members. You may see occasional advertisements in The NCAA News for staff positions when someone leaves the Association. Even then, that position is not automatically filled. We analyze that position to see if it is more important to replace it in another area. Only after that exercise is that staff position filled. In fact, for the last year and a half, we have been operating below our approved staff level.

I want to assure you that we are well aware of your needs and that the national office is being operated in a very professional manner with good cost-control measures in place.

As you are aware, the Executive Committee has committed two percent of annual television revenue to a membership trust. If we continue that throughout the duration of this television contract, there will be approximately \$18 million in a membership trust to serve as a "rainy day" fund pending further television negotiations. My personal feeling is that this is not satisfactory, and the Executive Committee has approved my recommendation that when our escalating television revenue reaches the annual average of our seven-year contract, we immediately cap all expenditures, new programs and disbursements throughout the rest of that contract and place those excess dollars into the membership trust. This would provide, including interest, approximately \$68 million at the end of the contract in 1997 and would provide us a good cushion should we not be able to renegotiate a contract as favorable as the current one.

If television receipts go down, the \$68 million could be used to guarantee those programs that are presently in place that provide direct dollars to our membership, such as catastrophic medical insurance and transportation and per diem expenses to our championships. If we would be successful in renegotiating our contract at the same or higher level, then the \$68 million would be distributed back to the membership. I think it needs to be clearly understood that this is not a \$68 million trust for the national office, but a \$68 million trust for the membership to be used if necessary, and if not, to be redistributed at the conclusion of the contract negotiations. We hope you will recognize this as a sound business practice and strongly support this decision.

As we continue to struggle with the financial crisis that we are

faced with, we all recognize that cost control is the most effective means. But at the same time, we have to be creative in looking at new sources of revenue. We are well aware that one of our primary sources—television revenue—is going down rather than up. We also know that most of you are involved in many efforts to raise dollars from private sources. We also recognize that there is a limit as to how much you can increase ticket prices for athletics events.

So as we look down the road the next few years to these challenging fiscal times, I want to point out to you that there are two areas that we have looked at that seem to be the best potential resources for new income. The first is licensing revenue. During the past year, there was about \$60 million in licensing revenue from collegiate products. Unfortunately, only \$10 million went back to our colleges and universities. About \$2 million went to companies that handle your domestic licensing. The rest of that difference between \$12 million and \$60 million represents pirate and counterfeit licensing. While it may be impossible to capture all of that \$60 million, a strong licensing program with good enforcement represents an excellent way to immediately increase revenue for many of our member institutions.

We propose that you consider an NCAA properties concept that would have the potential of generating a higher percentage back to the individual institutions, but also a program that could vigorously enforce a licensing program and reduce dramatically the amount of dollars going to counterfeit licensing. We will be providing you with more information on this in the very near future.

Now I am going to offer you a second revenue source, and this is the point at which, if you believe the rumors in the hall, I am supposed to drop a bombshell. Well, I am sorry to disappoint you; we don't have any bombshells to drop. But there is another source that is very obvious to this membership and has been discussed a number of times. That would be a Division I-A football championship game. While I realize that many are opposed to a full-blown playoff system, it would be possible to develop a single championship game after the New Year's bowls that could provide substantial new revenue for our member institutions. If the membership decided to do this, my recommendation would be that these dollars be distributed in the same manner as any other NCAA championship.

I want to make very clear that I am not pushing or advocating a championship playoff or game. But I think, as we look ahead at some challenging times, that we need to put this on our agenda. We need to be thinking about it and talking about it and planning for it, so if in the future we need to move in this direction, we are going to be prepared to do it. This is not something that is going to happen overnight; we are not going to snap our fingers and do this. And I am not advocating the demolition of the bowl system or anything else. For this to work, it has to come from you, the membership. It has to come from Division I-A. It has to be something you feel comfortable with and that you can embrace.

In addition to the financial condition of intercollegiate athletics and higher education, two of the most important challenges facing us

today and in the future are gender equity and minority issues. As you are well aware, we have appointed a task force to study the issue of gender equity. I have asked this task force to do three things.

First of all is to define gender equity. We all have a good understanding of what Title IX is; that's the law of the land. But gender equity is interpreted many different ways by different individuals and groups. So I think a clear-cut definition for our membership of gender equity is very important. Secondly, I have asked them to review our legislation, what we're doing with our championships to be sure that we don't have anything in place that would impede gender equity in all of the Association's affairs. Finally, I have asked them to establish a set of guiding principles that can be followed by our member institutions, and if they follow those principles, they can feel comfortable that their programs are providing gender equity.

I personally do not think Association legislation is the way to deal with this issue. We have not tried to legislate Title IX or our hiring practices and because of the diversity of our institutions, I think it is virtually impossible to put legislation in place to deal with gender equity. But that doesn't mean that we don't have a moral responsibility to do everything that we can within our means to guarantee that we have equity on our campuses.

I think we are aware that gender equity can be very divisive and polarizing, and it is important that we as a membership guard against this. We can talk about gender equity and all of the things that it involves, but until we resolve how football fits into the equation because of its size, and how equitable participation is determined, we will become deadlocked. I would personally be opposed to any plan that greatly reduces opportunities for one gender to enhance opportunities for another. I am pleased that the task force agrees with me. In one of its initial statements, it has been made clear that the task force's purpose is not to eliminate opportunities for men, but to enhance and increase opportunities for women.

I am concerned that football has become a target for some regarding gender equity. Football is important to intercollegiate athletics and the NCAA. Certainly we are smart enough, and committed enough, to achieve the goal of gender equity without damaging the quality of football and other programs.

I don't want anybody to misinterpret what I am saying. I am as committed as anyone to gender equity. It is something we need to be proactive and honest in dealing with it. The important thing is that we are committed to doing what is right.

We must develop good principles for determining the interest and abilities of women in intercollegiate athletics, and then we should proactively satisfy those interests, guaranteeing that those programs enjoy every accommodation provided to men. If we can do this conscientiously, we may find that this will solve the potentially polarizing problems. But we all will be successful only if we are willing to work together in a congenial and professional way.

I know there is some concern that our efforts on gender equity might diminish our commitment to minority issues. We just cannot let this happen. The minority opportunities committee has developed

a good strategic plan that I have strongly supported. But in addition to this, we need to make individual commitments to broaden the efforts to employ black coaches and make a concentrated commitment to employ and retain minorities in athletics administration throughout our membership. There is quite simply no justifiable defense for the limited number of minority coaches, athletics directors and administrators at our institutions. This Association has an important role to play in this regard, but there is no substitute for the aggressive recruitment of minority candidates at each and every institution for each and every position being filled.

While the graduation rate of our minority athletes is substantially higher than the minority students in general, it is still below the rates of other athletes and is totally unacceptable. It is important that individually we have a good plan in place to improve our minority hiring so that we can provide our minority athletes with positive role models in our coaching and administrative ranks. This will be a major step in promoting the educational welfare of our student-athletes and the institutions they represent. In addition, it is simply the right thing to do.

While we have mentioned the importance of positive role models for minority students, it is equally important that our intercollegiate programs provide positive role models, not only for the young people of our nation, but for adults as well. This not only includes our players and coaches, but our athletics directors and other administrators, including our chief executive officers.

It is interesting to note that the issues facing intercollegiate athletics today closely parallel those issues facing our nation. Our nation is concerned with ethics, integrity, tremendous financial pressures, low productivity, poor morale and the challenge of providing equal opportunities. We are dealing with many of those same issues in our athletics programs and higher education in general. Because of that, we have a unique opportunity to provide national leadership through our intercollegiate programs.

The visibility of intercollegiate athletics today can sometimes be a great burden. It also is a great opportunity. Often, the degree of public concern about our programs is a direct result of our enormous visibility. We should be proud of the manner in which we have responded to these concerns. We have made major changes in the last three years to correct deficiencies and to put our best foot forward. We will continue to improve our product and, by example, become a positive role model and provide strong leadership to our nation as a whole.

Let's not lose our vigor in developing positive change, and let's accept the challenge of providing strong national leadership in all that we do. If we accept that challenge, I can guarantee you that the impact will be felt in more than just intercollegiate athletics.

If I may, I would like to just close with a personal comment. These last two years have been very demanding and challenging for me, both personally and professionally. I have been able to deal with those demands and challenges in a positive, professional, and I think in a very productive way. I have been able to do that for three simple reasons. First of all, my very strong trust and faith in God. Without

that, I guarantee you that I would be totally helpless. Two, the love, support and patience of my wife, Jackie. And three, you people, this membership. I have received hundreds of letters, phone calls, personal comments of positive reinforcement and support. That has been so important.

My only wish, is that when my tour of duty is over, that you will be able to say, he made a difference. Thank you so much, and may God bless you all. (Applause)

President Sweet: Dick, thank you very much. I hope that the expression from the audience tells you how much we appreciate all that you have done. Again, you have given us a lot of meaningful food for thought. We appreciate that.

That concludes this opening business session of the 1993 Convention. I urge all of you to attend the annual honors dinner beginning at 7:30 this evening. We are now adjourned.

(The opening business session was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.)

Division I-A Business Session

Friday Morning, January 15, 1993

The Division I-A business session was called to order at 8 a.m. by Michael L. Kasavana, faculty athletics representative at Michigan State University.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Kasavana: Will the delegates please come to order. I would like to call attention to two of your Convention publications. First, on page nine in the blue program you will find the agenda for this business session. Also, on page 242 of the Official Notice you will find a list of six proposals to be acted on this morning.

Proposal No. 130 inadvertently was left off the list that appears on page 171 of the blue pages. We will vote on these seven items first. We then will entertain discussion of the proposals on the agenda for the Division I business session, which begins later this morning. If we have time left, we will discuss any other proposals you would like to discuss.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting—Telephone Calls

Robert M. Sweazy (Texas Tech University): I move Proposal No. 117

[The motion was seconded.]

Most of us in this room—presidents, athletics directors, faculty representatives—on occasion have demanded that our coaches do a better job of making more informed decisions about the student-athletes that they recruit. We not only demand that they learn and know about their athletics ability, but also about their academic ability, about their character, about their work ethics, about their moral values and so on.

Yet, those same people—presidents, athletics directors, faculty representatives—collectively known as the NCAA say: "Yes, we want informed decisions, but you can't communicate with those people except on very limited occasions. You can't talk to them on the telephone." That makes a lot of sense, doesn't it?

As parents, educators and advisers, we tell our children and other teenagers that they must make good, practical choices about the college or university they select. But collectively we—the NCAA—tell them you can't talk to the people who can answer many of the questions that you have about prospective universities. You virtually are denied access to one of the most efficient technological advances known to mankind—the telephone. Doesn't that make a lot of sense? One of the reasons that coaches, and particularly student-athletes, have been denied access to this technology is because they say it costs too much.

Please note that in Proposal No. 117 that July and half of August have been sacrificed. No telephone contacts will be made with the student-athlete during that time. Please also note that is the time that the recruiting list often contained 300 or 400 names. Instead, we are asking for unlimited contacts from December through February 15, a period of time when questions from student-athletes abound, when information is being communicated to potential student-athletes by recruiting services and at a time when recruiting lists contain fewer names. Therefore, there are fewer to contact. Others will argue that it consumes too much of the student-athlete's time. I would simply say that this decision—one of the most important that they will make and one that they are contemplating strongly during December through February—should require considerable thought and consume a lot of time.

Finally, let me tell you about the practicalities of the current situation. What we have today is a college coach who will call a high school coach and leave a message for a potential recruit saying "Please have that recruit call me." The coach delivers the message and the student-athlete returns the call collect. That is perfectly legal. However, the result is this: you have transformed a high school coach into a mere errand boy. You have communicated the same information, but you have required twice the number of phone calls and twice the amount of money to do so. It makes a lot of sense, doesn't it? I urge you to vote in support of Proposal No. 117.

Charles S. Harris (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I rise to speak against Proposal No. 117.

A bit of history: this proposal was to be effective in August and July of 1991. It was part of the initial reform movement as recommended by the Presidents Commission. The idea at the time was that restricting telephone calls to prospective student-athletes in effect served to give them the opportunity not to be harassed on a regular basis.

This legislation, while it does have reserve time, allows a student-athlete to receive unlimited phone calls between December and the signing of the National Letter of Intent.

It is the view of the Pacific-10 Conference that that was not the intent of the original legislation. We urge your defeat of this proposal. Thank you.

Fred H. Jacoby (Southwest Conference): I rise to speak in favor of this proposal. Under the current rule, the media and recruiting services enjoy more access to prospects than institutional staff members. Some of our legislation is well intended, and I think this is one. But I don't think it has been thought through.

Just think for a moment. For every action there is a reaction. The reactions of this amendment is that we are supporting greater use of recruiting services, which will become a cancer spreading throughout the country. For example, recruiting services are being used a lot by parents. I grew up in a small town in Ohio. I went back there about seven years ago to visit my mother. One of the gentlemen there called me up and said: "I am starting a recruiting service and I know you work with the National Letters of Intent program. Come visit me."

I went to his home. He had a one-room office and he had photographs spread around where he was placing these various students in college. That one room has grown to a suite of offices that I saw last spring. He came out with a publication and is building an office that looks like the one I see in Kansas City. It is huge. They also have started recruiting combines. In the Georgia high school football magazine, he is advertising for players to come down and work out. He is charging them \$15. Then he puts out a service where coaches can come in and sign up to watch the combine and pay up to as much as \$225. They record height, weight, vertical jump and the 40-yard dash time. It just goes on and on. In Texas we have a few recruiting services. One in Houston will put together recruiting services that will charge our college coaches anywhere from \$500 to \$5,000, depending upon the package that you buy. It could be a state package, a regional package or a national package. Then he goes on to the talk shows—the spin doctors I call them—and the spin doctor will ask: "How is Baylor doing in recruiting?" If Baylor does not sign up for his recruiting services, he will say: "Well, the coaches are not very aggressive and they are not out there working." The signing date comes. They will come in and say: "How well did they do?" He will say: "I will give them about a D-minus." Mainly because they didn't sign up for his recruiting services.

What I am getting at is this: parents are relying on these recruiting services that are spreading throughout the nation. They are becoming cancerous, and combines. The thing we have to do—and I implore you to think about this—is put recruiting back in the hands of the coaches and the high school guidance counselors where it belongs.

We have narrowed the telephone time down. I think this legislation makes a lot of common sense. So I would urge you to vote for Proposal No. 117.

James G. Malik (San Diego State University): On behalf of the Council, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 117.

Proposal No. 117 will adjust a period during which football staff members may call prospective student-athletes. The proposal will permit institutions to have unlimited telephone contacts between December 1 and February 15—unlimited per day, unlimited per week and unlimited for a 2½-month period. Such a proposal could increase costs to institutions.

But more importantly, it would create undue pressure on the prospect, which is contrary to the objectives of recent legislation sponsored by the Presidents Commission and the Council and adopted by the membership to assist institutions. You also may recall this proposal was defeated by the membership at the 1992 Convention. I also might add that I have been a speaker at seminars in San Diego. We have a panel and try to have some blue-chip athletes who have been recruited and their parents attend. One of the complaints was that unlimited phone calls were allowed. They could not take the number of calls that came in. Some of the parents said they had purchased a telephone answering service to try to reduce—some called it harassment—the large number of calls. I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 117.

Grant Teaff (Baylor University): I certainly may be a little naive in my approach, but let me give you a historical perspective from the coaches' standpoint. I have been blessed to serve just about in every capacity in the American Football Coaches Association, the College Football Association, the NCAA and most of the committees that deal with coaches. From a historical perspective, you need to understand that this particular rule originally came from the coaches. We wanted to limit the time that we would be able to talk to prospects, both in terms of cost cutting and from our concern about the student-athlete.

This was proposed and somehow changed to only one call per week during the time of the contact period. We came back as a meticulous group of coaches, worked out the details—first, from a cost standpoint, evaluating every aspect of the cost of telephoning—and made a proposal. I might add that this was defeated last year by less than five votes. So there is a lot of concern about this particular issue and the next proposal that will come up. They are interrelated because they deal with coaches in the field being able to do their job properly.

My naivete may center on the fact that I feel like that if we present something that we believe will have cost containment in line with the Presidents Commission agenda and still be able to perform our job, then it should be received in a very affirmative way from this membership. I may be naive, but I can tell you that this is a rule that coaches want. We had a meeting for the first time of the Division I-A head football coaches that brought forth this particular proposal and the next one that will come up. It was both well-thought out and, I might add, it was a unanimous vote of coaches who attended. Not everyone from the Pacific-10 Conference attended, but almost everyone from the Big Ten Conference attended.

This particular proposal had a unanimous vote by our coaches because it allows us to do the job we need to do. When we get into a recruiting situation, we are given the responsibility of determining that young man's character, his integrity and his ability to graduate from our university. The utilization of the telephone will not increase costs one cent. In fact, I think costs will decrease. A collect telephone call to my university is a lot more expensive than a call going out from my university. Also, you don't have a way of controlling the "contact period" telephone calls. Who can trace a quarter in a pay telephone?

Please give us the opportunity as coaches to do our job and do it in the way that the presidents want in terms of cost control. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 117 (Page A-129) was approved by Divisions I-A and I-AA.]

Contacts—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Grant Teaff (Baylor University): I move Proposal No. 118.

[The motion was seconded.]

I won't go back on historical perspective because it is the same as I just mentioned to you. The Division I-A head coaches worked long and hard on this particular proposal.

First of all, we feel beyond a shadow of a doubt that it can be enforced. I have visited with many of our representatives on the NCAA

enforcement staff. They concur that they'll have the ability to enforce this particular rule. It gives us a chance to evaluate prospects on a one-time need basis in the student-athlete's home. You also must remember that we now have two dead weeks in the middle of the contact period, which begins December 1, and that this does not measurably increase the number of contacts. When the rule was put in, with the evaluation times, you can go into that school without making contact. From a coaching standpoint, this is repugnant because we now move back to the so-called "bump rule," whereby a person going in under the guise of evaluating one prospect can be in a position to be seen by another prospect.

We want a clean rule. We want one that is in line with the Presidents Commission concept on cost reduction. I can tell you as a coach and as an athletics director that this does not change one penny the amount of money that will be spent by the seven coaches. We have cut costs by limiting seven coaches to go on the road. Those coaches now are going to be on the road, whether they are evaluating or whether they are in contact. Give us the chance again to be able to evaluate that young man. As a football coach, I have the responsibility for a prospect's conduct off the field and his academic progress. That is my responsibility. Give us the chance again to get to know that youngster, not to sneak into a high school under the guise of evaluation, see the guy and make a farce of it. Give us dignity, give us a chance to recruit the way the coaches believe. This again, Mr. Chair, was unanimous by the Division I-A coaches. For every committee I have been on in the CFA, the legislative committee of the American Football Coaches and NCAA, it is unanimous. Thank you.

James E. Delany (Big Ten Conference): I am a member of the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics. It seems as though Proposal No. 118 puts us into 1994 already. I think No. 118 is the sleeper of this Convention. There is no presidential or Council opposition, and yesterday we spent hours debating 14 scholarships.

Our committee is trying to stay away from scholarship and coaching reductions and look at operational costs associated with some sports. For the past four months, we have been studying the financial condition of intercollegiate athletics. We have come across a couple of statistics. One is that 83 percent of every dollar spent in recruitment in intercollegiate athletics is spent on men's recruitment. The principle right now is campus contacts, four evaluations. We have 110 days of contact or evaluation days and seven full-time coaches. That is 770 man days for recruitment or evaluation. Coach Teaff is right. I am going to argue that this potentially could take the three-contact situation and increase it to 11 contacts. So we would be moving from three contacts to 11 contacts.

I don't know who is sneaking around where. I am sorry if they are. Regardless of the rule, it is not responsible for people sneaking around. We have some preliminary concepts on the table right now that the American Football Coaches Association is aware of and will have an opportunity to express themselves on. But I am concerned that we are going in the opposite direction. Right now we have a

total of three contacts and four evaluations. We are suggesting that that number be reduced to four personal contacts or evaluations and that we go from 110 days down to 70 days. We are trying to concentrate on the operational expenses associated with intercollegiate athletics and keep away from reducing scholarships and coaching positions. If this group intends to extend the contact period in Proposal No. 118, it is sending a strong message to the committee that it wants more infractions of recruiting and operational plans.

I urge your defeat of Proposal No. 118. Let us come forth with a proposal and debate it. If you want to kill it and let this be a companion proposal next year, put it on the table and pass it. Thank you very much.

Jason C. Wilkie (Central Michigan University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee opposes this proposal. Committee members felt that the recruiter's job is to be fair. Three school visits and the phone calls that were just passed should be sufficient to judge the character of an athlete.

We felt that heavy recruiting negatively affects a small percentage of athletes. It is to their benefit. We discourage the adoption of this proposal.

Vincent J. Dooley (University of Georgia): I would like to speak on behalf of this proposal and give you a little bit of historical perspective. In all my involvement in athletics recruiting over a period of 30 years, I don't know of any one single rule that has caused us more problem than a contact rule.

There probably has been more violations in that area than in any one single issue regarding recruiting. That is up until about five years ago when for the first time we had a rule that was enforceable, and for the first time we had a rule that every coach agreed upon. I suppose if you were to poll the coaches, they would say today that that probably was the best recruiting rule that we have ever had. Now we have gone away from that. I don't think the increase will be 11, probably a total of seven. I think it would increase costs a minimum amount. I think that any minimum increase in cost would be well worth it to once again restore the total confidence that coaches would have in each other, and to have an enforceable rule that everybody agrees upon.

So I encourage the adoption of the best recruiting rule that we have ever had on the books.

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): I join Jim Delany in opposing this proposal for the reasons he stated. We hope that this will be incorporated in the work that his committee is doing. I would add that the Pacific-10 Conference presidents, with all deference to Wil Bailey and his people, apparently didn't sleep on this one like the Presidents Commission did. I think it is a critical piece of legislation—one that should not be rightly considered—and should be defeated because of the increases.

Vince just indicated that they wouldn't take the number of permissible visits. I assure you that every Pac-10 coach will be in there 11 or 12 times for contact instead of three if this would be permitted. I suggest to all delegates that this flies in the face of the contact that

we have been approving for the last three or four years. It is a very undesirable proposal.

Charles M. Neinas (College Football Association): I rise to question the arithmetic of Commissioner Delany. If I read the calendar correctly, there are 31 days in December, 30 days in January and three days in February—until the letter-of-intent signing date—which totals 64 days.

If you subtract the dead periods that exist around the American Football Coaches Association, between Christmas and New Year's, you come up with 52 days.

Fred H. Jacoby (Southwest Conference): Our coaches support this particular piece of legislation unanimously. We are in a strong recruiting area like many of the rest of you are. I just believe that this proposal can be enforced.

If you go with what we have on the rule book now, you are going to have coaches going back to the same high school. They will visit Prospect A. Then they will visit Prospect B, get a bump on Prospect A, then go back and visit Prospect C to get a bump on Prospects A and B again.

So there is no savings of money. All we are going to do is make repeated trips to get bumps with other prospects. Our coaches believe that this proposal can be enforced. I have sat through those meetings and they are unanimous. I think this is one that deserves your support.

Mr. Teaff: I rise again to say that I am naive, but not that naive. We have seven opportunities to visit a prospect on his campus during the contact period. If you say four weeks in January, four weeks in December and a portion of a week that is surrounded by 48 hours of dead time, then you have got seven times.

If I calculate it correctly, there are four evaluation periods and there are three contacts already in the rule. The rule again was brought forth by coaches and was taken by a group and changed last year. This particular proposal also failed by less than five votes. This is a very important proposal to our coaches and athletes. It has nothing to do with cost containment. When Mr. Delany comes up with those proposals, we will approach them at that time. We will have the coaches look at them and try to give our very best in following the agenda of the Presidents Commission. This particular proposal needs to be voted in the affirmative.

Eugene F. Corrigan (Atlantic Coast Conference): I am a little bit concerned that we have passed this telephone call proposal for football and have not done anything comparable for basketball. Now we are going to change the contact rule in basketball, which has been providing the fuel to drive the engine for this Association.

Yesterday we turned back the request from basketball coaches just to delay implementation of having a certain number of scholarships. Now we are moving ahead with this. I am very concerned about this. I hope we will do what Jim Delany did—just delay it and let his committee come in next year with their overall proposals.

Mr. Delany: I would like to defer to David Price, the NCAA expert, on how this will increase the number of contacts from three to 11. He is my source on the subject.

David Price (Pacific-10 Conference): I am glad to serve as Jim Delany's calculator. It always is nice to know the difference between 10 and 11. I can't speak for Chuck Neinas' comment. I believe he said 51 days. But if you take the calendar and determine if there would be one day of the week available—between December 1 and the signing date, which was February 3 this year—you would come up with 12 opportunities to make contact in certain years. Depending on how the calendar falls, it could be 11.

[Proposal No. 118 (Page A-130) was defeated by Division I-A, 48-62, and Division I-AA, paddle vote.]

Evaluations—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Dutch Baughman (Oregon State University): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move Proposal No. 130.

[The motion was seconded.]

Our football programs conduct spring practices at a time most beneficial to the institution, normally based on academic calendars, weather, so on. Circumstances sometime warrant that spring practice be conducted later in the spring.

While May currently is the key evaluation month for recruiting, the late spring practice may cause the evaluation opportunities to be reduced by having only 15 consecutive days in the month of May. Many high schools are closed Memorial Day. If the school is forced to conduct its May evaluation in the second to latter part of the month, it will be disadvantaged by losing one day because of being closed Memorial Day.

By adopting this proposal, institutions with later spring practices would not be required to count Memorial Day in their 15 consecutive days for evaluation. We urge support of Proposal No. 130.

[Proposal No. 130 (Page A-143) was approved by Division I-A.]
[The Division I-A business session was adjourned at 8:45 a.m.]

Division I-AA Business Session

Friday Morning, January 15, 1993

The Division I-AA business session was called to order at 8 a.m., with Thurston E. Banks, Tennessee Technological University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Banks: This is the Division I-AA business session and we're open for business. I would like to introduce the parliamentarian, Frank Bonner from Furman University, and our staff support, Nancy Mitchell from the NCAA.

[Note: Various announcements were made and the Division I-AA members of the Council were introduced.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Restricted-Earnings Coaches—Division I-AA

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think it's appropriate that I first apologize to the membership for a very poorly written intent statement, which was written in some haste. But I would caution the membership that the intent paints the worst case scenario, in that it reads: "Permit I-AA institutions to take advantage of two additional restricted-earnings coaches..."

This basically is the same legislation that the Southern Conference brought forth last year. We were told that the membership would be more comfortable taking out the word "unlimited" and defining "not more than two." It's our intention with this legislation to give flexibility to the institutions without exceeding a cap of \$24,000, which currently is in the Manual. There has been some discussion about if it is possible to have multiple restricted-earnings coaches above the two, and if you can create a cost-of-living factor that is not variable.

We would say to you that this also allows you to retain your volunteer coach and gives them a home. We urge support of Proposal No. 62.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): The key thing about this proposal is that it provides flexibility to an institution about how it wants to use its part-time people in that \$24,000 cap. There is no additional expense required of an institution. But it does provide an institution the opportunity to use a volunteer coach.

If you have someone that has been in coaching for many, many years and now is retired and is not looking for any income but just wants to work with young people. This would provide that person an opportunity to help the kicker or to work with the secondary or whatever. It gives that person an opportunity to be of assistance

without adding any additional expense. In Division I-AA we need to be sensitive to the need for these types of people because we have had fewer coaches available to us than Division I-A football. Some of us do compete against Division I-A. It would be helpful to have this type of flexibility.

I urge your support.

C. Claude Teagarden (Western Carolina University): I speak in favor of this proposal and echo what Mr. Hauser just said concerning the volunteer coach. But there is one thing in particular I would like to mention—the sixth-year student who has completed his eligibility, but is just finishing up. This is a very valuable resource that could be made available under this proposal at absolutely no extra expense to the institution.

Michael A. Ploszek (University of Maine): I speak in opposition to this proposal.

Although from a cost-containment standpoint it certainly makes sense, it's a shortsighted move on our part, given what we have heard at the Convention the past couple of days relative to the entire position of restricted-earnings coaches. Something will happen over the course of the next year relative to this entire classification. We're best served to not vote on this this year. Let's wait to see what the future holds and move forward.

If anything that Coach Krzyzewski said yesterday could be taken as something to listen to—if we are to believe what he said about abuses lurking with the restricted-earnings position—then perhaps we're opening ourselves up to additional abuses.

I urge this body to vote against it.

David B. Wagner (Georgia Southern University): In order to have abuses, you have to have dollars. That's something that Coach Krzyzewski might know about. But in Division I-AA, we're just trying to take our budget and stretch it as far as we can. We have some flexibility with this legislation. It doesn't cost us any more money. You're going to spend \$24,000 whether you have two or you have four. With our diversity, it's an opportunity to help some of us.

I urge that you vote for it. I think it's reasonable. I think it's rational. It gives us that flexibility. Each of us can do what we wish with it, but it provides more flexibility.

Benny Hollis (Northeast Louisiana University): I urge the delegates to vote for this proposal. For years we had graduate assistant coaches. Almost all of us had four of them. We provided tremendous coaching opportunities for young people. That's part of our charge, as well as educating our people. It's been very difficult at our place this year with the two.

We fool ourselves with these restricted-earnings coaches to start with. There are not many folks who can live on \$12,000 a year. You get them in there, and they are kind of a "pie in the sky." This presents us terrific part-time assistant coaches. With the \$24,000 at our place, you could have four graduate assistants. You could use these positions much more effectively than what we're using them for now.

This is good legislation. I don't know what threats are out there. Every Convention I come to there is a new set of threats. I don't

think it's that big of a deal. Let's deal with right now for the upcoming football season. It would help us. There were a lot of people who tried to have junior varsity football teams this year just so they could have two more coaches. Let's get it all out on the table and allow our people to have four coaches with this \$24,000.

I urge your support of this.

[Proposal No. 62 (Page A-84) was approved by Division I-AA, 52-41, two abstentions.]

Division I-AA Coaching Limitations—Contact and Evaluation of Prospects Off Campus

W. Harold Godwin (University of Idaho): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 63.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to permit an institution to specify that one restricted-earnings coach may replace one full-time coach for the purpose of off-campus recruiting. It has no cost impact. It would give flexibility to institutions that wish to allow a restricted-earnings coach to go on the road in place of a full-time assistant coach.

Our primary reasoning is that full-time coaches are the best individuals to remain near campus or on campus to deal with the student-athletes who we already have a responsibility to in our program.

I urge the adoption of this proposal.

Mr. Banks: There is an interpretation issued by staff and the Council with regard to Proposal 63 that was distributed.

Mr. Wagner: Let me echo the comments from the Big Sky Conference. This is excellent legislation. None of us have enough academic-support services at our level. This permits us to take one of our coaches and let him help us with our young men and women—well, young men. Wouldn't be women. Gender equity hasn't gone that far (laughter). We would be able to keep one of our full-time coaches on campus with our young men to stay involved in our academic-enhancements efforts. I think it's an excellent idea.

We only recruit 63 players over a four- or five-year period. We can only sign nine players this year. We have all those coaches out signing them. I don't know what they are doing. I would like to have one of them back on campus.

Michael A. Ploszek (University of Maine): I was willing to be convinced on this legislation. Now I am totally confused.

First, I didn't realize this was an academic proposal. If we have too many coaches on the road, then why don't we have legislation that takes one off the road.

I don't urge the Convention to vote one way or another. But I urge the Convention to think this one through before we move forward.

[Proposal No. 63 (Page A-84) was approved by Division I-AA.]

One-Time Transfer Exception—Division I-AA

Willard S. Belknap (Southland Conference): I move Proposal No. 78.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 78 came out of the Division I-AA national meeting that was conducted last May in Dallas. It had very broad support

within I-AA. It simply extends the one-time transfer exception within the current rules to student-athletes in football who transfer from I-A to I-AA institutions. For the most part, it's noncontroversial legislation. It is my understanding that there is substantial support within Division I-A ranks for this proposal.

I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 78 (Page A-97) was approved by Division I-AA.]

Resolution: Division I-AA Football Scholarship Limits

David B. Wagner (Georgia Southern University): Resolution No. 88 is intended to communicate to the membership the present threats to I-AA football, including the need of many of our members to maintain grant-in-aid levels that facilitate a competitive opportunity with other Division I football programs; a need for Division I-AA football member institutions to find an acceptable competitive environment for those 27 institutions previously in Divisions II and III that are likely to become Division I-AA members, and to respond to these needs in the present atmosphere of rapid reform.

We were asking nothing more than the two-year moratorium, similar to what the Presidents Commission requested. With due respect to the harmony we wish to facilitate, and the compassion we hope that all would have toward our circumstance, we graciously respect the recommendation of the parliamentarian, and withdraw the legislation.

Contest Exemptions—Division I-AA Football

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 105.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 105 would permit each Division I-AA member to annually participate in one conference-sponsored postseason tournament game without counting that game against the maximum permissible contest limitations in football. By definition, the conference-sponsored postseason tournament game is one between teams that are not identified until the end of the preceding regular season, nor selected until after the teams have been named to the NCAA Division I-AA Football Championship. It is important to note that teams in the conference tournament could be selected from within the conference that sponsors the tournament or from among two or more conferences that might jointly sponsor a tournament game.

Proposal No. 105 initially was intended to accommodate the low-cost nonscholarship football programs in Division I that will be required to reclassify those programs to I-AA next fall. These new I-AA members then will be faced with the reality that their level of competition virtually rules them out of any NCAA postseason consideration. Some of these same institutions in the past have been privileged to participate in a single postseason conference tournament game without counting that game against the maximum NCAA contest limits, as currently permitted under Division III rules. Proposal 105 would allow them to continue the same privilege in Division I-AA.

The adoption of Proposal No. 105 not only would provide these low-cost nonscholarship football programs their only opportunity for postseason play, but also would provide the same privilege for all Di-

vision I-AA members.

I therefore urge the support of this Convention for this proposal.
[Proposal No. 105 (Page A-121) was adopted by Division I-AA.]

Evaluations—Division I-AA Football

Gene Bleymaier (Boise State University): I move Proposal No. 122.

[The motion was seconded.]

This basically is a housekeeping item. At the 1992 Convention, Proposal No. 134 as amended was adopted in Division I-A. In Division I-AA, the delegates reconsidered and passed Proposal No. 134, thinking it also was amended. As it turned out, it was not amended. We were advised by the chair to let the vote stand and to amend it at this time with an immediate effective date.

So basically, this is a housekeeping item that we thought we did last year. We would like to take care of it now.

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): We were advised earlier that perhaps No. 121 would be available to this body also, although it's listed in the program as a Division I-A football proposal only. It would have an impact on this.

Mr. Banks: I was not notified with regard to No. 121. I've been advised that I-A is voting on that right now. If the delegates so desire, we could withdraw our motion and wait on No. 122 also.

Mr. Waters: No, sir.

Mr. Banks: All right. We'll proceed.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): If we pass No. 122, will we be barred from voting on No. 121 because it will address the same subject? I know it's a different bylaw, but I just want to be sure that we will have the parliamentary discretion to vote on No. 121 if we should so choose later in the meeting if we do pass No. 122.

Mr. Banks: We will not be able to. No. 121 was proposed only for Division I-A. Division I-AA did not get included in that. We are not allowed to vote on that.

Mr. Orleans: Whether or not we vote on 122?

Mr. Banks: That's true.

Mr. Waters: Let me make sure I understand that. We're going to be allowed to vote on No. 121 later after hearing the results from Division I-A?

Mr. Banks: No, we are not included in No. 121. If you're thinking of the reference to No. 117, that was a typographical error that we were left off No. 117. We should have been on No. 117 in the program and that was corrected. But we were not included in No. 121.

Douglas B. Fullerton (Montana State University): Just to remind you, all No. 122 does is give us a 13-month recruiting process due to this mistake. We're making it 12 so it will make sense. That's all we're doing with No. 122. If we don't have a vote on No. 121, I don't want that to confuse anybody. We need to vote on No. 122.

[Proposal No. 122 (Page A-133) was adopted by Division I-AA.]

Evaluations—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 130.

[The motion was seconded.]

We are in a situation where there is this spirit of harmony and waiting on Division I-A to see what it does. This is much like that. The only difference in this is that it's pretty good legislation, regardless of what they do. We urge your support of this. All we're doing is exempting Memorial Day from the counting during the May evaluation period, which gives us a chance at the end of the month.

It's good legislation. It should not be controversial. We urge your support.

[Proposal No. 130 (Page A-143) was approved by Division I-AA.]

Division I-AA Scheduling Requirements

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Football Conference): I move adoption of Proposal No. 133.

[The motion was seconded.]

All Division I members that currently sponsor Division II or III football will be required to reclassify their football programs to Division I effective September 1, 1993, or be left with no option other than to discontinue the sponsorship of football. This legislation will permit a Division I institution that sponsors a low-cost football program to appeal to the Division I Steering Committee for a waiver of the Division I-AA football scheduling requirements if fewer than six other Division I-AA football programs exist within a 500-mile radius of the institution's campus. This would give appropriate relief to those institutions with scheduling problems and enable them to continue to sponsor football without facing excessive expenses to secure viable schedules.

I have presented these remarks in support of Proposal No. 133 on behalf of the Council. On a personal note, I wish to briefly add that last year's debate of Division I-AAA football was unfortunately divisive. Proposal No. 133 was developed by the Collegiate Commissioners Association as a good faith effort to seek an equitable solution for all members affected by this issue—both the low-cost Division I football institutions, as well as the traditional I-AA members.

I urge your support of this proposal.

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): I speak in support of No. 133 and want to emphasize its importance to the very limited number of Division I members who currently sponsor Division II or III football and must reclassify next fall. They essentially are isolated from other low-cost football programs.

Without this geographical waiver, there is no doubt that these few schools would otherwise be forced to discontinue their programs. It therefore is essential that we adopt this proposal to make it possible for these few programs to continue. I urge the adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 133 (Page A-146) was adopted by Division I-AA.]

Recruiting—Telephone Calls

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Football Conference): To have consistency between divisions, I move adoption of Proposal No. 117.

[The motion was seconded.]

I wish to neither speak in support nor opposition. Let it rise and fall on its merit.

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): There is a need for consistency.

Division I-AA Business Session _____ 87

tency. We have enough rules now. It's hard enough to explain to prospects what's going on. There are parts of No. 117 I really like, particularly in Paragraph (b) when we talk about not being able to telephone a prospect before August 15 and once a week from August 15 to November 30.

Division I-A now will be calling prospects at the institution's discretion from December 1 through February 15. We're going to have Division I-A institutions calling these prospects every day. Our guys are going to be allowed to call them once a week to explain their position.

In the spirit of consistency with Division I-A rules—although I'm not real favorable to the resolution, I am real favorable of being consistent and not putting our football coaches at a tremendous disadvantage—I urge your support.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): I think Wright has put our dilemma pretty well. I don't think either of us put a whole lot of value in being consistent with our brethren in Division I-A just for consistency's sake, especially when it is opposing the Presidents Commission's views of the last three or four years.

I would ask each of us before voting for this to be really sure that we do need to be able to make those calls in competition with Division I-A, as opposed to just having consistent rules. But I share Wright's view that we've got a dilemma created by the other division that's not of our own making.

Robert A. Alost [Northwestern State University (Louisiana)]: On behalf of the Council, I rise to oppose this legislation.

It was voted down last year. It was initially inaugurated as a cost-cutting measure. The need for that still exists. Two wrongs don't make a right.

If you've not read Willie Morris's book, "The Courting of Marcus DePree," you need to do so. That young man had to leave home in order to escape all the calls and coaches' visits.

The reason for this is to bring some sanity to what we're doing.

[Proposal No. 117 (Page A-129) was approved by Division I-AA.]

DISCUSSION

Mr. Banks: At this point, we have no other information from Division I-A on their items. I suggest that we discuss some other items that may be of interest to the delegates.

Willard S. Belknap (Southland Conference): I recognize this proposal will not be voted on in this meeting, but it has an impact on this body. I do not fully understand the pros and cons of Proposal No. 131—unclassified football. It certainly has an impact on this group. I would like to hear some discussion on No. 131.

Ronald D. Stephenson (Big Sky Conference): Proposal No. 131, as I understand it, basically is the same thing that was brought forth last year as Division I-AAA football and defeated. I urge the delegates to support Proposals 72 and 133, both of which we feel gives people who want the Division I-AAA football concept everything they want and need to institute that concept. I urge the delegates to support Nos. 72 and 133, and vote no on No. 131.

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Football Conference): I echo Ron Stephenson's remarks and add that with the passage of Nos. 105 and

133, the only piece of the Division I-AAA accommodation to low-cost football within Division I-AA football that is left undone is No. 72, which we will have an opportunity to vote on this afternoon. If that passes, I believe it's fair to say that No. 131 would be completely unnecessary legislation.

Mr. Belknap: It's my understanding that Proposal No. 131 differs considerably from the proposals we dealt with a year ago in that football could not count as one of the required number of sports under this proposal. I believe that's different than the Division I-AAA proposal a year ago.

The thing that people in our conference keep asking is: "Where does this hurt I-AA football if No. 131 were passed?" "What are the down sides?" I suppose there is some corrosion in the sense of what occurred last year. The commitment a year ago was to accommodate those institutions within Division I-AA. But if this is preferable to them, if they cannot count as a sport, if they cannot vote on either I-AA or I-A issues, it's hard for us to see the down side.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): I would identify two down sides.

One, we have made great progress in the last year in assimilating into Division I-AA those institutions that previously would not have been in it. It gives us voting strength and a presence in Division I that is greater than we had before. That was evident in the Division I-AA athletics directors meetings that we had this week and in the I-AA meeting that we had last May.

I would not presume to speak for what used to be Division I-AAA, but I talked to Rich Ensor, commissioner of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference, and some other I-AAA commissioners. Their view is that they ought to be in I-AA and be strong voting members in I-AA, not just for football, but in all the rest of the Division I sports because we often have a different perspective to bring to Division I interests. We wouldn't want to weaken that.

Secondly, I would regret the Convention taking an action that would encourage schools to add the substantial expense of football with the gender-equity implications that it has and not be able to count that sport in all of their NCAA requirements. I think it creates for those schools a cost problem in accommodating their equity obligations to add football and yet not be able to count it for NCAA purposes and therefore have some additional men's sport to add for membership purposes.

So my view is that it does not serve their interests. We ought to not give them the opportunity to make that mistake.

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): We received information last night that Division I-A may consider or attempt to rescind Proposal No. 78, which we passed earlier. To rescind action of this group would take a two-thirds vote of Divisions I-A and I-AA voting together, is that correct?

Mr. Banks: The parliamentarian says that is correct.

Mr. Waters: We would urge this membership that if Division I-A makes an attempt to rescind 78 that we stand together. This is pretty good legislation for our institutions. All we have done is extended the one-time transfer exception that we currently enjoy in a number of sports.

There will be an argument put forth by Division I-A that we're going to be recruiting off their campuses. I don't believe that is realistic when you remember that the one-time transfer exception requires written notification that you have approval to contact and place this person on your campus. We urge this body that if rescission becomes an issue this afternoon, that this group stand together and say we are prepared to do what's best for Division I-AA football.

Pauline N. Saternow (Youngstown State University): Two things with respect to the speaker's remarks. We were at first prepared to vote against the one-time transfer restriction. But when our football coach attended the American Football Coaches Convention, he was given to believe by the Division I-A institutions that they had no objection to that. So I don't believe that there will be a move to rescind.

With respect to Proposal No. 117—recruiting telephone calls—for the changes that we just voted the effective date is immediate. I would like to clarify. This is with the close of the Convention?

Mr. Banks: Upon adjournment of the Convention.

I have information now on the disposition of Proposals 118 and 120 in Division I-A. No. 118 failed in Division I-A, and No. 120 was withdrawn. So with that information, I think we're ready to proceed as to what we want to do with those proposals.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Contacts—Divisions I-A and I-AA Football

Willard S. Belknap (Southland Conference): I move Proposal No. 118.

[The motion was seconded.]

I urge this group to defeat this proposal.

Jason C. Wilkie (Central Michigan University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee opposes this proposal. The student members felt it is a recruiter's job to make a decision on the character of an athlete through three school visits. Coupled with the extension of phone calls just passed, home visits and other contacts, three visits should be sufficient to judge an athlete's character.

We felt that although heavy recruiting negatively affects only a small percentage of athletes, it is to their benefit that we discourage the adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 118 (Page A-130) was defeated by Division I-AA.]

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Banks: That completes our agenda. Are there other items that anyone wishes to discuss?

Frank R.A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): I would like to call this group's attention to Proposal No. 82. It's not voted on until tomorrow morning, but I am calling your attention to it because I think it may present a dilemma for many of the institutions here.

The proposal is representative of that kind of well-intentioned financial aid legislation that we often consider and adopt without a clear understanding of what the implications are.

Current legislation provides that all on-campus student employment is countable. This amendment proposes to count only employment in the athletics department, or employment for which the athletics department's interests intercede. The official interpretation also specifies that the Federal Work-Study Program would fall under that same definition of employment. So the intent here is to let student-athletes work around campus and earn extra noncountable aid, which is an apparent benefit to needier students.

Therein I think lies the dilemma. This is similar to the controversial Proposal No. 72 last year, which we defeated. This legislation now will eliminate counting of some athletics aid for purposes of Division I institutions meeting the minimum financial aid requirements for divisional membership. For moderate budget program administrators, the questions are simple. How many institutional dollars or how many scholarship equivalencies toward the minimum will you lose by not counting these resources? Have you analyzed the impact of that on your program?

Douglas B. Fullerton (Montana State University): This will probably not make me popular, but I would like to have the delegates think a little bit about Proposal No. 78, the one-time transfer, in another light.

These young men and women who are transferring to your institution, are the hardest ones to get through school, whether they be junior college transfers, or transfers from four-year institutions. The reasons that some of these people are transferring are varied. The fact is, we all know programs that seem to have people who started everywhere else in the country and end up at these programs. They only are there for athletics purposes.

I'm not sure No. 78 is good legislation. We will probably continue to vote against it, even if there is a rescission vote.

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): If it's not good for football, then it probably wasn't good for our baseball programs or tennis programs or track programs or all of the other programs in which we had this one-time transfer. We're here to help young men and women play and participate. That's what we're all about.

Mr. Fullerton: All you have to do is compare the graduation rates across the sports to find that there are some different motivations and different expectations from the athletes in the different programs.

When you get to basketball and football, there seems to be a completely different acceptance of graduation level than there is in some of those other programs.

Mr. Banks: Are there other items of interest? We stand adjourned.

[The Division I-AA business session was adjourned at 8:49 a.m.]

Division I-AAA Business Session

Friday Morning, January 15, 1993

The Division I-AAA business session was called to order at 8 a.m. by Division I Vice-President R. Elaine Dreidame, University of Dayton.

[Note: Because no votes were taken in the session, the following is a summary of the discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

OPENING REMARKS

Chair Dreidame announced the proposals to be voted on at the Division I business session, those that would be withdrawn and those that had amendments-to-amendments. She indicated that delegates were free to discuss any of them.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The delegates discussed various proposals to be considered during the Division I session and took straw votes on some of them.

The first proposal considered was No. 64, which would permit all three full-time Division I men's and women's basketball coaches to recruit off campus during the summer evaluation period. In a straw vote, a slight majority of the Division I-AAA membership indicated that it was in favor of the proposal.

The membership of Division I-AAA almost unanimously indicated that it was in favor of Proposal No. 98, which would specify that a Division I institution may play its first basketball contest on the Friday immediately after Thanksgiving, and Proposal No. 137, which would specify that indoor and outdoor track and field shall be counted as one sport for purposes of fulfilling Division I sports sponsorship criteria.

The Division I-AAA membership asked for an interpretation of Proposal No. 82, which would indicate that earnings from on-campus employment outside the athletics department during the academic year count as institutional financial aid only if the athletics interests of the institution intercede on behalf of the student-athlete. A slight majority of the Division I-AAA membership favored Proposal No. 82.

A majority of the Division I-AAA membership was in favor of Proposal No. 101, which would permit Division I institutions to exempt annually the Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game from their maximum number of basketball contests.

DISCUSSION

Division I-AAA delegates discussed at length Resolution 151—

Federation by Sport—and were urged to support the resolution to examine its feasibility.

The delegates also discussed the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism's decision to again address the definition of countable financial aid and that the committee favored a narrower definition. In a straw vote, the delegates unanimously favored that the Division I-AAA representatives to the Council recommend that the current regulations regarding countable financial aid should be maintained for a period of time in order to measure the regulations effectiveness.

[The Division I-AAA business session was adjourned at 8:38 a.m.]

Division II Business Session

Thursday Morning, January 14, 1993

The Division II business session was called to order at 8 a.m. by Division II Vice-President Anthony F. Ceddia, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Ceddia: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the Division II business session. I would like to introduce our parliamentarian, Paul Engelmann, professor of economics from Central Missouri State University.

[Note: Various introductions, voting instructions and other announcements were made.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Consent Package

Mr. Ceddia: Before we begin voting this morning on the Presidents Commission business, it is traditional for the Division II business session to review legislative proposals.

We have identified the legislation in such a way that each member of the steering committee has become familiar with certain proposals. We will move through those proposals in a block, taking each block at a time and asking if there are any questions from the membership. We then not only will listen to your views, but we also will try to answer any questions or give interpretations regarding those proposals. I would like to begin with the consent package. Ollie Bowman, my colleague on the steering committee from Hampton University, is responsible for the consent package. The microphones are open if any member has any questions or needs any clarification from Ollie on Proposal Nos. 1 through 14. You are welcome to state your concern or your point of view. Thank you, that takes care of the consent package.

Presidents Commission Grouping

Next is the presidential grouping. Dorothy Dreyer is prepared to help us with any questions or concerns regarding the presidential grouping.

James F. Battle (Virginia Union University): Would someone explain the implications of the initial-eligibility clearinghouse from the standpoint of the student-athlete? How does a student-athlete put this procedure in process? Once a student determines that he is being recruited and needs to have his freshman eligibility placed into the databank, will any institution that has an interest in that student-athlete be able to get that information from the databank? Is there a limit on how many institutions can call up the databank before the student would have to pay the fee again? I am not sure how this is going to work.

Charles N. Lindemann (Humboldt State University): The collection of data will be conducted by the ACT from all high schools in the United States. Information will be collected by ACT and will not require anything of the prospective student-athlete. Student-athletes who have an interest in any of our institutions will pay one fee one time and that will get them into the database. There is no limit on the number of institutions that can request that information. Student-athletes can identify institutions that they would like to receive the information and institutions can request the data as well.

So it is going to be a very simple process for the student. The student will be subject to the same provisions in terms of the fee that are required of anyone taking the ACT or SAT. Those who are entitled to a fee waiver will get one for this fee as well.

Ollie Bowman (Hampton University): I don't remember Chuck saying this, but the only institution that can receive an initial-eligibility ruling from ACT would be those to which the student-athlete signs a release to give it to them. So if you are not recruiting that student or that student is not interested in you, you could not get the information.

Governance

Cynthia E. Ryder (West Chester University): Could you give me an interpretation of Proposal No. 153? What are the implications for some of these "bubble sports" if No. 153 were to fail?

Janet R. Kittell (California State University, Chico): My understanding is that Proposal No. 152 is more important to championships in the "bubble sports." For instance, Division II wrestling would be at stake if we didn't extend the sponsorship for one additional year. No. 153 would allow continued participation; however, institutions would have to pay the per diem and transportation. So my concern with No. 153 is that those institutions that had the money could afford to send their kids; however, No. 153 would extend the life of those sports that are currently in jeopardy and allow the good work that the Executive Committee has done this year to come into effect.

Mr. Ceddia: The other reason why that proposal is not being supported, particularly by the Council, is that the Division II Championships Committee and the Executive Committee are looking at the whole concept of championships and moving toward a restructuring and redesign of championships. They would like that process to unfold before any action is taken on issues like this.

WAIVERS

[Note: The Division II business session heard petitions for waivers of Division II membership from Alderson-Broaddus College, Barton College, Belmont Abbey College, Bluefield State College, University of Charleston, Coker College, Concord College, Fairmont State College, Glensville State College, University of Hawaii at Hilo, High Point University, Indiana University-Purdue University, Kennesaw State College, Lane College, University of Minnesota, Morris, Moorhead State University, Mount Olive College, Northern State University, St. Andrews Presbyterian College, College of St. Francis, Salem-Teikyo University, South-

*west State University, West Virginia Institute of Technology,
West Virginia State College and West Virginia Wesleyan College.
The petitions were approved.]*
[The meeting was recessed for 10 minutes.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse

Charles N. Lindemann (Humboldt State University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will establish a clearinghouse to certify initial eligibility to prospective student-athletes in Divisions I and II. The proposal has been subject to thorough study by the Council Subcommittee to Review the Concept of Establishing an Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse, the Academic Requirements Committee and the Council.

Each Division I and Division II institution currently certifies initial eligibility of recruited prospective student-athletes as well as walk-ons. This process dictates a significant amount of duplicative work by testing agencies, high-school counselors and campus administrators. The subcommittee is confident that the clearinghouse will benefit the membership, student-athletes and high schools by eliminating this duplication. This process also will provide for a level playing field because only one 48-H form will exist for each high school and trained, unbiased professionals will render a single certification decision for each prospective student-athlete. Information will be more credible and will be available on a more equitable basis. In addition, the clearinghouse will remove the burdensome and expensive institutional responsibility of certifying the initial eligibility of prospective student-athletes.

The annual cost will be approximately \$23 per student-athlete. This cost will be shared by students, who will pay between \$15 and \$18 and the NCAA. Needy prospective student-athletes will be able to obtain a waiver of the clearinghouse fee by utilizing the same form used to request a waiver of the ACT and SAT test fee. Upon filling out that form the fee requirement automatically is waived. The remaining \$500,000 will be paid by the Association. Bear in mind that the institutions are not being required to pay that fee, the NCAA is doing so.

Time lines will be emphasized very strongly so that the clearinghouse will provide each prospective student-athlete and member institutions preliminary and final certification information in a simplified and equitable manner. Immediate access to eligibility information will be available through the clearinghouse database. Prospects and their parents will have limited access to the system. Once all eligibility information is obtained by the clearinghouse, it will be able to render an eligibility decision within one hour. In addition, the clearinghouse will be able to issue a written copy of a student's eligibility status within 48 hours. Walk-ons will be dealt with within one hour as soon as the clearinghouse has all information.

The effective date of Proposal No. 17 is August 1, 1994. Clearinghouse operations will affect the certification of prospective student-athletes who are members of the 1993-94 recruiting class and there-

after. Accordingly, clearinghouse operations will begin to come on-line during late summer 1993.

In closing, the adoption of this proposal will bring certification of initial eligibility into the 21st century and beyond. I urge a yes vote on Proposal No. 17.

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): I am speaking today for the Presidents Commission and I want to second what Mr. Lindemann has said.

During the Presidents Commission's last meeting, there was considerable debate about the cost of the clearinghouse. We tried to compare the cost with the cost to our own institutions. We voted almost unanimously to support the proposal once we determined it was cost effective.

The "level playing field" also was one of the real motivating factors. It really does provide that level playing field.

I wanted you to know that there was a considerable debate. I think we examined the pros and the cons and finally thought it really would be in the best interests of the NCAA.

Christ Petrouleas (Wayne State University (Michigan)): What will be the procedure for foreign students? Will the certification process include the replacement for the core classes? What will be the impact on students who would graduate before 1993-94 but have not yet made application to a university and are interested in participating?

Mr. Lindemann (Humboldt State University): Foreign student-athletes will be handled through the clearinghouse; however, the NCAA will handle the process the same way that it always has with respect to their eligibility. In other words, any decisions that need to be made about initial-eligibility will be handled by NCAA. The same will be the case with respect to core courses. The NCAA still will have the responsibility and staff will still handle questions concerning eligibility.

With respect to students who graduate early but who do not go through the eligibility process, I believe this is intended for the class of 1994-95, not for earlier classes. So I believe they will be handled as they always have by the institutions.

Gene A. Carpenter (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): What if one of our coaches gets a late start in recruiting a student-athlete, and he doesn't have our school listed to receive his clearance. Have you thought about that at all?

Mr. Bowman: It is the same way as if he or she were releasing the SAT scores. You get a shot at four schools. If your school is not one of those four, the student still can submit an additional list for releases just like he does with the scores now.

Mr. Carpenter: I would hope in our infinite wisdom we can make that an easier procedure for the student-athlete and the university. I hope we're not getting ourselves bound up.

A lot of us in Division II are out there 30 days after the national letter of intent recruiting date. We go in on a kid in the middle of February, and he doesn't have our particular school listed. He is getting panicky about making a decision. There are two or three schools

that he talked to back in January whose names are already on the list. For some of us who only have two or three coaches recruiting, we are at a disadvantage. That might be a concern we need to ponder.

Mr. Ceddia: The comment was made that the student-athlete has to request a transcript from the high school even if you are late on recruiting an athlete. I think in this case it would just be a matter of the student-athlete requesting the clearinghouse to release his information. So it would be the same kind of process.

Mr. Carpenter: There is no way the school can declare him eligible?

Mr. Ceddia: No, it has to come from the clearinghouse.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): Can we have a waiver statement on the application that in effect gives SAT the approval to send that eligibility information to any NCAA institution that asks? We could amend the process. I don't understand why we aren't doing that.

Charles N. Lindemann (Humboldt State University): It can be done.

Mr. Hammond: You are saying it can be done. My question is will it be done.

Mr. Lindemann: I don't believe there was any restriction on the number of institutions that a student could identify to receive the information.

We wanted to give the student-athlete the opportunity to identify particular institutions that he or she was interested in. But this was not meant to be restricted. The only concern, frankly, was with the student's right to privacy. We wanted to protect students in the same fashion that they currently are protected. As it stands now, without a student's permission, you cannot request information from a high school. We want to maintain that for the integrity of the student-athlete. That really is the only constraint that we want to place on this process.

Mr. Hammond: I am merely suggesting that we put a box on the form. If students want their records to be accessible by any NCAA institution, they check that box. Or they can target four or five institutions. That would legally permit us to give the student the choice to be looked at by a vast number of institutions. I think that is an advantage to the student-athlete.

Christ Petrouleas (Wayne State University (Michigan)): I believe someone said the certification process will require the clearinghouse to certify all student-athletes. But I also heard someone give an interpretation on foreign student certification that we would continue the current process and that we would have to do the same thing on students who had not attended school at least before the 1994-95 class. I have to assume that the certifying institutions would continue that process for those student-athletes. The NCAA does not certify foreign students. Our certifying office certifies them.

Mr. Ceddia: That would remain the same.

Mr. Petrouleas: Would it be the same case for those students who graduated in 1991-92, but decided not to enroll until 1996-97?

Mr. Ceddia: Yes. The clearinghouse will have a database for foreign students.

Mr. Lindemann: The NCAA will retain the decision-making authority with respect to comparability, whether it be for foreign students or for 48-H forms.

When there is an issue about whether a particular course is comparable to the NCAA requirement, staff will continue to do that. But once that decision is made, it will be placed in the clearinghouse database and the clearinghouse will handle responses thereafter. Students who graduate before the database is operative will be handled as they always have. From the date that the clearinghouse database is in place, all certification will be done through the clearinghouse. Does that clarify that issue?

Mr. Petrouleas: For foreign students we will have to send high-school grades as well as test scores to the clearinghouse, which will interpret if they are from Germany or Italy or France or wherever, based on the criteria established by the NCAA? We will not have to do that ourselves?

Mr. Lindemann: That's my understanding.

Mr. Ceddia: The chair wants to make an editorial comment on the earlier suggestion about a blanket release that the student would be able to provide on the form. This is just an editorial comment, but it is my understanding in right-to-privacy legislation that such a blanket release would not stand the test of legal scrutiny. ACT requires the student to ask for release of information to any institution. I don't think that we would be able—and this is just an opinion, others would have to react to it—to provide a blanket release. That is just an observation.

Mr. Hammond: Let me differ with that observation. My guess is that your institution and many others obtain blanket releases from student-athletes now for private information about weight, height and health conditions that we distribute to newspapers that are not specifically designated by the student-athlete. So I believe that the blanket release would be an available option.

Mr. Ceddia: That information will be passed on. I think the committee would probably look at that and make a decision later.

James L. Frazier (Missouri Southern State College): Today our student-athletes receive from the ACT a copy of their results. It is not official for certification of eligibility. Could that not be the case with the clearinghouse so that the student would be able to receive a copy so they in turn would be able to work with the institutions and then the official certification could come at a later date?

Mr. Lindemann: That's going to happen.

Mr. Ceddia: The chair has been informed that that is what will occur.

Wilburn A. Campbell (Albany State College (Georgia)): At what point will the student receive certification on his status and what would be the appeal process?

Mr. Lindemann: Students will be notified the same instant that anybody else will be notified. Students will have access to the database and will be informed about how they or their parents can access

that information. The student will know at the same time or before the time that any other institution would know.

Any concern about whether the certification is appropriate will still remain subject to staff interpretation. So if a student has a problem with the ACT, it will not be handled by ACT. It will continue to be handled by staff as it always has. That process won't change.

Rev. Kevin G. O'Connell (Le Moyne College): We ought to consider what often is a practice in our institutions and boards of trustees. Major changes that are introduced should be thought about for awhile before they proposed for a vote. It strikes me there are a number of important aspects that are now being talked about for the first time.

It might be more appropriate to work a lot of these out and come forward with a much more refined proposal rather than saying after we adopt the clearinghouse that we will try to figure out other ways we can avoid various minor negative consequences that might be quite major for individual institutions. Although it sounds to me like in the long run it's a favorable proposal, I am inclined to be opposed to passing it at this time.

Carey Hughley (North Carolina Central University): The clearinghouse proposal certainly will make our job easier on campus. However, it bothers me that this cost is being passed on to the student. I don't know if this is a concern of anyone else, but I can imagine myself now having a tennis player decide that he wants to walk-on and the first thing that I have to do is give him a form and request \$15 to \$18.

Is there any possibility that a mechanism can be devised where the institution can make this payment?

Mr. Ceddia: There were a number of alternatives that were explored regarding the financing of this. It was agreed that it would be a combined process with the Association, the institution providing some support and the student paying some of the cost as well. There is a fee waiver for those students who qualify.

Ollie Bowman (Hampton University): The gentleman who talked about needing more time, this resolution was passed by this body a couple years ago. This legislation has been on your campus since at least August. So we have had some time to look at it. We have been working on this thing for a couple of years. There is a provision built in for a fee waiver.

We are trying to level the playing field to the extent that one outside agency will collect all of the 48-H information and then will read that against NCAA requirements. The information will be released to the student and any institution the student identifies. You have two checks. The student has to ask you to send it to Hampton and Hampton has to ask for it to be sent from the student. So there is that check. This proposal also addresses the foreign student issue. There is a foreign student advisory committee that was consulted.

I don't think we read as deeply as we should have because it is nothing new. You have taken the work from your institution and given it to someone else.

Mr. Hughley: The fee waiver certainly is fine. That's good for the

student who qualifies. My concern is not that student. My concern is the walk-on student who you as an athletics director are going to have to request \$15 to \$18 before the student-athlete can participate. Many of our students have different priorities. Although they may have the means, their priorities are different. They may well choose not to participate.

For some of you, this may not hurt. For my situation, it could hurt. It could be the difference between having a sufficient number of athletes to have a team.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): What happens if a high school neglected to file 48-H forms? Is the principal merely told your seniors are not eligible for NCAA athletics as freshmen? A lot of principals have a problem with that 48-H form. What happens if you have a high school that doesn't file a 48-H form?

Mr. Ceddia: We have that problem now with eligibility. If they don't file it, the same problem would exist. The school would have to file one.

Mr. Lindemann: We think this process is going to be simplified. As it stands now, the institution has to provide a 48-H form for every student prospect to every institution that's interested in him or her. Under this provision, there will be a single 48-H file that will take care of it for the institution for that year or for subsequent years, providing there isn't a change in curriculum at that institution.

Mr. Barkey: You said earlier that the process will be the same for foreign students. If we request a 48-H form from a high school in Germany, does it have to provide a 48-H? They don't even understand what that is.

Mr. Ceddia: The 48-H form is not used with international students.

Mr. Barkey: They are not used?

Mr. Ceddia: No.

Mr. Barkey: You explained how this will be handled. I have heard for a year how simple and wonderful this is going to be. It doesn't seem that simple and wonderful to a lot of us.

For example, a walk-on student shows up in late August and wants to come out for volleyball. How long does it take to process that walk-on student? I assume transcripts and paperwork will have to be submitted?

Mr. Lindemann: If you have the transcript in hand as you would for a walk-on student who you were going to certify . . .

Mr. Barkey: That's the next question. You can't send it out of your admissions and records office. Can the university send the student's high-school transcript?

Mr. Lindemann: Provided you have an official transcript, you can put it, your student-release form and test scores and express mail them to the clearinghouse. You will have a response within an hour.

Mr. Barkey: When you get that information?

Mr. Lindemann: Correct.

Mr. Barkey: You said official transcript?

Mr. Lindemann: Yes.

Mr. Barkey: A high school transcript that has been submitted to

admissions and records obviously is open for certification purposes. Is that still an official high-school transcript as sent by the institution?

Mr. Lindemann: Yes, provided that it is sent from the institution, not from the athletics interest.

Mr. Barkey: Do student-athletes who start getting recruited in November have to submit transcripts then, with a senior year remaining to be completed in order to have some understanding about their initial eligibility or wait until the end of the year?

Mr. Lindemann: No, preliminary certification can be handled as soon as a transcript is received—the same is the case now. It will be handled by the clearinghouse instead of by the institution and will only have to be handled once. If you are applying to a dozen institutions, you only have to go through this process once rather than 12 times.

Mr. Barkey: Correct. But you have not completed the last two semesters of high school. Do you submit a report on courses in progress so that you can get an accurate estimation of your initial-eligibility status, or are they going to be asked to wait until the end of their second semester and submit it in the spring?

Mr. Lindemann: Ralph, it wouldn't change from what goes on now. You would get a preliminary certification of eligibility based upon the work that had been completed at the time initial certification was done. You would get final certification after receiving final grades.

Mr. Barkey: Do they submit another transcript in January and then another one when they conclude high school in order to get all their records up-to-date?

Mr. Lindemann: In no way does it change from the current procedure at your institution except that it needs to be done once by the clearinghouse instead of by your institution.

Charles M. Dobbs (Metropolitan State College of Denver): I am familiar with the ACT process when it analyzes information for financial aid. When students apply for financial aid, they are the millionth person on the list. You would have to wait a long time.

Going back to the example of the volleyball player, or in our case, a baseball player walks-on. Students already are claiming financial aid for next year. That student is still one-millionth on the list. How do we account for different sports starting in mid-semesters or people in different years or the fact that some schools start their semesters at different times? We start fairly late in January. Others may start the first of the month. You couldn't move your transfers. How is that going to work? Will the ACT actually analyze people? Not in the order they come in, which is what they do with financial aid, but perhaps when semesters start because we need quick decisions?

Mr. Lindemann: In dealing with this process, we are very concerned about deadlines. We were very concerned about the timeliness of data. The ACT is gearing up its staff to be able to process applications at remarkable speed. We are very comfortable with the 21st century technology that ACT will employ to do this. Believe me, we looked at it very, very carefully. I had the same reservations that

many of you have.

But upon seeing what their capabilities were, I am convinced they will be able to handle this and handle it in a very responsible manner. They will be able to handle it in the time frame that they have identified.

P. Laverne Sweat (Norfolk State University): I had a case in which a student-athlete walked-on my team, but her high school inadvertently had left a course off of the 48-H form. She originally was declared ineligible. In checking, we found out that that course would have made her eligible.

How, if the institution is taken out of the process, will problems of this nature be resolved?

Mr. Ceddia: The appeal process will be there. In this case, there would be an opportunity to review that very quickly.

Ms. Sweat: How would the university know that if it does not see the 48-H form?

Mr. Lindemann: Bear in mind that 48-H forms will be submitted to the clearinghouse much earlier than the situation that you described. The 48-H forms should be received months ahead of time. If there is an error, it ought to be identified early.

If you were in a situation, however, where no other students from that institution had made an effort to certify their eligibility, you would go through the same process as you would go through now. As soon as it was identified that that student was ineligible, the reason would be identified immediately. That student will be able to go through the same appeal process currently in place. Those corrections should be made very quickly.

Terry Wanless (University of North Dakota): Does this proposal have to pass in both divisions to take effect?

Mr. Ceddia: No, it does not.

Mr. Wanless: So if Division II passes the proposal it will gear up and start in?

Mr. Ceddia: Yes.

Gene A. Carpenter (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): We came prepared to support this legislation. I think it is a great gesture on the part of the NCAA to pick up the tab and that the kids pick up part of the tab. Many institutions had to hire people to handle 48-H forms. I don't know what effect that is going to have back on your campus, but I think it is a great idea.

There are a lot of little things that have come up today. Maybe I started it. Maybe we should table this until next year. Maybe we need to investigate. I am not so sure now that we want to go forward with this legislation because Division II always gets caught in Division I-made legislation. We do not have the staffs to implement a lot of these items.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): This proposal was under discussion when I was a member of the Presidents Commission. It does go back about two years. A lot of people have worked very hard in developing it. I know there are a lot of questions about it. But it appears to me from listening to the discussion, that in most cases those questions have been answered.

There probably is some other problems to be worked out, but I think they will work them out. I think that this is one of the most worthwhile proposals that has been advanced in this Association in a long time. Someone described it to me as the greatest thing since snuff. I prefer to refer to it as the greatest thing since sliced bread.

[Parts B and C of Proposal No. 17 (Page A-32) were approved by Division II, 180-28, roll-call vote.]

Initial Eligibility—Core Curriculum Requirements

Rev. Kevin G. O'Connell (Le Moyne College): I move Proposal No. 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

Richard A. Johanningmeier (Washburn University of Topeka): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I speak in opposition to this proposal.

This proposal has several flaws. For example, it would preclude the acceptance of advanced math courses like calculus and trigonometry as core courses. It cites a college board study as support, but neither the Academics Requirements Committee nor the Research Committee have had the opportunity to review that report. The Academic Requirements Committee also is concerned that some high schools may not offer a fourth year of core-course English as mandated by this legislation. This problem may increase with recent budget cuts. Although the spirit of this proposal is admirable, it is too flawed to merit your support.

The Association adopted significant changes to its initial-eligibility legislation last year. Let's not tinker with those changes without a truly compelling reason to do so.

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): The Presidents Commission supports the Council's position to oppose this legislation.

[Proposal No. 19 (Page A-34) was defeated by Division II, 39-171, roll-call vote.]

Initial Eligibility—Core Curriculum Requirements

Cynthia E. Ryder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): I move Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think this proposal adds a little bit of permissiveness and opportunity for our students to count a foreign language, which is a valuable course to take in high school.

Richard A. Johanningmeier (Washburn University of Topeka): On behalf of the Council, I rise to oppose this proposal.

When the Academics Requirements Committee considered legislation last year to increase the minimum number of core courses from 11 to 13, the committee consciously identified English, mathematics and natural or physical science as the additional core-subject areas because it believed that these topics constituted the most fundamental core subjects. The committee specifically did not include the softer core subjects like social science and foreign language.

The committee and the Council believe that the initial-eligibility standards adopted last year should not be changed without compelling circumstances. Those compelling reasons do not exist. Prospective student-athletes still may use two years of foreign lan-

guage to fulfill core requirements even if this legislation is not adopted.

This legislation really is not necessary. I urge you to defeat it.

Rev. Kevin G. O'Connell (Le Moyne College): This legislation further supports that American education is woefully poor in the study of foreign languages. The internationalization concerns of our nation are increasing. Since it is very difficult for students to begin foreign languages from a relatively low level after they have entered college, anything that would make it more likely that even a few of our student-athletes would take foreign languages at the high-school level should be strongly supported.

I urge you to reject the shortsighted advice that says to vote it down.

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): Again, the Presidents Commission supports the Council and requests that you vote against this piece of legislation.

[Proposal No. 20 (Page A-36) was defeated by Division II, 98-113, roll-call vote.]

On-Court Basketball Practice—Divisions II and III

Lynn Dorn (North Dakota State University): I move Proposal No. 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the women's basketball committee, and certainly on behalf of the men's basketball committee, I would like to recommend to the delegates that we support this legislation.

We feel that it is imperative to the welfare of the student-athlete that they are able to gain the two weeks that have been lost. We have tried to maximize the use of our facilities and maximize study opportunities for our student-athletes. But by losing those two weeks, we feel that our coaches are holding the students longer, almost using the entire four hours.

So certainly on behalf of the student-athletes, we support this proposal.

Janet R. Kittell (California State University, Chico): On behalf of the Council, I stand in opposition to Proposal No. 40.

This proposal was identified by the officers of the Presidents Commission for inclusion in the Commission's special legislative grouping. It is scheduled for a vote today because it would alter reform action dealing with playing and practice seasons. The Presidents Commission and the Council are on record in opposition to any proposals that would change the existing legislation. This proposal would lengthen the basketball-playing season by adding two weeks to the preseason-practice period. The sponsors argue that more practice time is needed to prepare student-athletes for the physical demands of competition. The steering committee believes that there is ample time in the preseason-conditioning period for student-athletes to get in shape and that it is not necessary to have more on-court time.

The problems of time demands on student-athletes are no different in one division than another, so please don't get caught up in the argument that the November 1 starting date should apply only in Division I. This proposal would increase the time demands on basketball student-athletes.

On behalf of the steering committee and with the support of the Presidents Commission, I urge that you defeat this proposal.

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): I am a member of the Presidents Commission and I support what Ms. Kittell said.

It seems to me over the years that this comes up every once in awhile. We have been having legislation now for some time for an even playing field. It seems to me that it hasn't hurt our basketball athletes at all. I think this definitely would be an encroachment on all of the reform that we have put in place in Division II over the years.

On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge that you vote no.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): I generally support the Presidents Commission, but I am concerned about moving back the scheduling of the first game as a result of the delay in the beginning of practice.

It has forced a lot more games into a smaller time period because we didn't reduce the number of games when we compressed the season. The effect at my institution and institutions that we play is that athletes are missing more classes because we aren't able to spread the season out over quite as much time.

So I guess I rise in support of the proposal even though it is being opposed by the Presidents Commission. At least in practice, the proposal is not accomplishing what we intended.

Jane Meier (Northern Kentucky University): I also speak in favor of this legislation.

I don't know if you realize this, but instead of practicing two hours a day from October 15 on until the start of the season, which is the third week of November, our athletes are practicing four hours a day starting November 1. I fail to see that that is an advantage to the student-athlete. I think trying to compact the season is a detriment to our athletes.

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): Although November 1 may not be ideal, I believe taking it back to October 15 is going to take us right back to where we were. And I think we all agree that we had to make some changes.

Moving the starting date back to October 15 does not solve the problem of the playing season and when games start. You are still going to compact those. All you have done now is put the kids on the court for two more weeks beating up on each other.

I urge your opposition to this. I think this is something we can look at more closely and come up with some sort of a compromise in the future.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): I urge the defeat of Proposal No. 40. I am very concerned to hear someone say that students have to practice four hours a day instead of two because of the starting date of the basketball schedule.

What is going on at an institution that allows its basketball coach to run four hours of practice? It is a matter of institutional responsibility. Two hours is more than enough; one and a-half hours if it is well run, and the students can spend some time in the library

Ms. Meier: Very true. Our athletes do spend time in the library. They end up having study hall two hours after that.

When you have a team made up of eight freshmen, the reality is you have a lot more work ahead of you. When you are in a competitive situation, you want to be successful. You can't be successful unless you work hard at it. That is why they are practicing very hard for four hours.

[Proposal No. 40 (Page A-59) was defeated by Division II, 98-115, roll-call vote.]

Distribution of Graduation-Rate Report

Robert A. Barrett (Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne): I would like to move Proposal No. 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

I really think this works quite well to have the NCAA distribute graduation-rate reports. I know it is an estimated \$151,000 added to its budget. If you look nationwide as to what Divisions I and II are doing, the total cost savings will benefit us as individual institutions. This is an area our Association could really help us.

I urge approval, even though it is going to cost more money.

Mr. Ceddia: The mover of the motion should note that that \$150,000 estimate has since been adjusted. The projected cost could go as high as a half-million dollars.

Ollie Bowman (Hampton University): On behalf of the Council, the Executive Committee and the Special Advisory Committee to Review Implementation of 1990 Convention Proposal No. 24, I urge you to defeat this proposal.

There are three good reasons it should be defeated. The first is cost. The Executive Committee is concerned about the \$151,000 cost. However, it may go as high as \$450,000 if we mail the reports to roughly 30,000 public, private and parochial high schools and two-year colleges. This year there will be three mailings—the 1992-93 Division I report, which is due out in March; the 1993 Division I report, which is due out in August, and the 1993 Divisions II and III report, due in October. This is going to run the cost to about \$450,000. It is not clear if these costs will equal those that have been paid by member institutions. The Executive Committee and the Council are not convinced that this proposal is not a financial wash. These funds could be used in a more essential way for Association services or returned to the membership.

Secondly, we think the proposal is unnecessary. Since the sponsors first submitted this amendment, the Interpretations Committee and the Council have approved an interpretation that greatly reduces the burden on the Association to distribute the graduation-rate summaries. The official interpretation now requires that an institution forward the two-page summary only to those recruits and parents who have been contacted in person by the member institution, rather than as soon as the recruiting process begins. This interpretation greatly reduces the number of prospects who must receive the institution's graduation-rate summaries and gives institutions more time to accomplish this task.

The third reason to vote against this proposal is the most impor-

tant. The NCAA currently is waiting for a response from the Department of Education about regulations to implement the Student Right-to-Know Act so that the Association may apply for a waiver of substantial comparability. Substantial comparability is determined by the Department of Education so that member institutions will not need to supply graduation rates both to the NCAA and the Federal government. Until these Federal regulations are available, we do not know how the distribution of these reports as described in this proposal will affect our waiver request. The Council is seriously concerned that the proposal may threaten efforts to obtain a waiver of substantial comparability.

For these reasons, I urge the defeat of this proposal.

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): The reasons for voting against this proposal were very well stated. I just wanted to add the Presidents Commission's support of what has just been said. When the executive committee of the Presidents Commission reviewed this, it really didn't think that the benefits outweighed the costs. It just isn't worth it. It isn't that much of a burden on an institution. Why go through the NCAA when it is unnecessary and costly?

Diane Husic (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): I would like to speak in favor of this proposal.

The NCAA wants us to wait for the Federal government to make its interpretations. The institutions don't have that luxury at this particular time. We still have to do the graduation-rate distribution.

We talked about the cost to the NCAA. What about the cost to the individual institutions? Division II schools may not have the luxury of being able to hire extra people. We talk about time demands on student-athletes, but sometimes the time demands on people involved with compliance is getting out of control.

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): Did I understand Mr. Bowman to say that this only would be required for in-person contacts and that we would not have to send this material out to all prospective recruits?

Mr. Ceddia: That's right.

Mr. Allison: I have not seen an interpretation. Is that in print?

Mr. Bowman: We will get it for you.

Mr. Ceddia: I believe it is.

Mr. Allison: I know Alzheimer's is a terrible disease, but I had not read it.

I echo what Ms. Husic said. It is nice to be concerned about the burden and cost. But this burden and cost should have been considered last year when we passed this legislation.

Mr. Ceddia: The interpretation was approved by the Council in April. With all due respect to my colleague from Colorado, who I do not believe is suffering from Alzheimer's, we will try to get the reference for you.

Mr. Allison: I appreciate that.

Carol P. Powell (NCAA): This is the interpretation that was issued: "An institution must provide the graduation-rates data specified in Bylaw 30.1.1 to a prospect as well as a prospect's parents,

guidance office and coach at the earliest opportunity subsequent to the institution's first arranged in-person encounter with the prospect or the prospect's parents or the day prior to the prospect's signed acceptance of the national letter of intent or signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid, whichever is earlier."

This information was mailed to Divisions I and II conference commissioners November 2, 1992, in a memorandum.

Lynn Dorn (North Dakota State University): I need a clarification of the interpretation. Is it not correct that we are going to be doing the persistence rates in contrast to the graduation rate? And does this legislation then mean that we will send out the persistence rates because the graduation data has been withdrawn or at least changed? Can you help me with that clarification, please?

Mr. Bowman: Right now we are in negotiations with the Department of Education. The department is willing to accept from Divisions II and III persistence rates initially, but we can only do that if we get the waiver of substantial comparability. That is holding us up right now.

[Proposal No. 18 (Page A-33) was approved by Division II, 169-39, two abstentions, roll-call vote.]

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

[Note: The slate for Division II representatives to the Council was approved as presented.]

[The meeting was recessed.]

Friday Morning, January 15, 1993

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. with Mr. Ceddia presiding.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Professional Enhancement Programs

Douglas T. Porter (Fort Valley State College): I move Proposal No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit athletics staff members to participate in established, formal professional enhancement programs such as the NFL Minority Coaches Fellowship Program. It will benefit all individuals and organizations that participate. The Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee feels that professional enhancement programs are vital to our profession. Whereas this committee's primary focus is to address issues related to minority interests and opportunities, this legislation would permit all athletics department members to participate in well-established, tightly defined and implemented professional enhancement programs. It would allow the participants to receive compensation and expenses consistent with that received by other program participants.

It further suggests that the Council establish necessary policies and guidelines regarding participation in such programs and that these guidelines could be set by the Council through various NCAA committees.

I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 66.

[Proposal No. 66 (Page A-87) was approved by Division II.]

Coaches—Endorsement of Noninstitutional Publications

Charles N. Lindemann (Humboldt State University): On behalf of the Council and Recruiting Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

In essence, these publications report solely on the athletics program of a particular institution, including information on the prospects the institution is recruiting. Often these publications contain a full-page advertisement containing written statements of support for the magazine, including encouragement to subscribe to the publication by institutional administrators.

Both committees felt that these publications provided an opportunity for inequity in the recruiting process for the institution that had such publications. These magazines often are located in the community of the institution. The magazines will pay transportation and other expenses for prospects to visit the community in order that photographs can be taken at activities or landmarks. These photographs and interviews then are featured in the magazine.

The NCAA should not be involved in any attempt to regulate or control these publications; however, NCAA institutions should not be involved in promoting such publications. Since the actual connection between the institution and the publication is strongly implied with these ads, this legislation attempts to put more distance between institutions and the publications.

[Proposal No. 67 (Page A-87) was approved by Division II.]

Coaches—Scouting-Service Consultant

Mr. Lindemann: On behalf of the Council and Recruiting Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 68.

[The motion was seconded.]

Some scouting services list institutional coaches and staff as board members or advisers to the recruiting service. This proposal will eliminate the perception that these staff members are involved in any manner with the scouting or recruiting service.

This proposal also will eliminate any misperceptions to a prospect that by paying for this service as offered by the recruiting service, the prospect will in some fashion increase the opportunity that these coaches will review the prospect's skills and possibly recruit the prospect.

Finally, the question of permissible evaluation opportunities also arises. If the prospect provides videotape or other evaluation information to the recruiting service and the advisory coaching staff reviews such information, should such a review constitute an evaluation? In order to eliminate any inadvertent violation of the permissible number of evaluations and any misperception by a prospect, I encourage your support of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 68 (Page A-88) was approved by Division II.]

Initial Eligibility—Change in Sport Classification

Janet R. Kittell (California State University, Chico): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 71.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 71 will permit Divisions I and II institutions currently playing in Division III sports to apply Division III freshman eligibility requirements during the 1993-94 academic year only, provided that the institutions continue to apply Division III financial aid guidelines in that sport during the 1993-94 academic year. This proposal will provide these institutions an opportunity to gear up their admissions and registrars offices to certify the initial eligibility of additional student-athletes. In addition, these institutions will realize significant cost savings.

I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 71.

Robert M. DeGregorio Jr. (Merrimack College): I would like an interpretation. When we moved to Division I hockey, we had to abide by the more stringent rules immediately. Why now would institutions not have to go by Prop 48 and the academic requirements that are required in Division II?

Mr. Ceddia: This legislation is before the Convention so that institutions would not have to go by the more stringent rules for that period of time. They also would not be allowed to give grants-in-aid.

[Proposal No. 71 (Page A-90) was approved by Division II.]

Initial Eligibility—Test-Score Requirement

Robert N. Evers (New Mexico Highlands University): I move Proposal No. 69.

[The motion was seconded.]

Dorothy E. Dreyer (Wayne State University (Michigan)): On behalf of the Council, I rise to speak in opposition of this proposal. A brief bit of background can help you understand this position.

In October of 1989, ACT began to administer an enhanced ACT assessment and recommended that a composite score of 18 on the enhanced ACT was in concordance with the score of 15 on the prior exam. The NCAA amended Bylaw 14.3 to reflect this information. This concordant value did not increase the minimum required ACT score but recognized that a score of 15 on the previous ACT was equivalent to an 18 on the enhanced ACT.

In May of 1991, however, ACT submitted research to the NCAA that provided an updated estimate of the concordance between the ACT and the SAT examinations. These materials were based on additional studies and indicated a closer association between an SAT of 700 and an ACT of 17 rather than 18. It should be emphasized that the ACT did not find that a composite score of 18 was a mistake or an error. The change to 17 was identified as the change in the concordance table based on more current statistical information. The Research Committee and the Academic Requirements Committee then reviewed the ACT studies and recommended to the Council that they be accepted as valid.

In October of 1991, the Council concluded that a change from 18 to 17 should not be retroactive and there were two very good reasons for this conclusion. First was the issue of competitive equity. The retroactive application of this legislation would affect two classes of students—those who were seniors in 1990 and those who were seniors in 1991. By the time the ACT studies were first reported to the NCAA, the senior class of 1990 had already completed its first year

of collegiate enrollment. Most of the senior class of 1991 had completed the admissions and recruiting process. For both classes of students, member institutions had made recruiting and admission decisions based on the student's status as qualifiers and nonqualifiers at that time. Many institutions did not recruit or admit these students specifically because they were nonqualifiers or partial qualifiers. To retroactively change the status of these students now would be particularly unfair to those institutions.

Legal concerns were the second reason to defeat this proposal. The sponsors indicated that this legislation would only restore a fourth season of competition to affected student-athletes and would not restore the financial aid that the students could have received had they been qualifiers. NCAA legal counsel, however, has advised that the member institutions could nevertheless be vulnerable to lawsuits from these students if this legislation is adopted. A successful lawsuit requiring the retroactive awarding of financial aid could have unfortunate ramifications for member institutions and therefore is best avoided.

For these reasons, the Council urges you to defeat this proposal.

[Proposal No. 69 (Page A-88) was approved by Division II.]

Individual Eligibility—Change in Sport Classification

R. Wayne Edwards (University of Massachusetts, Lowell): On behalf of the 10 sponsoring institutions, I move adoption of Proposal No. 73.

[The motion was seconded.]

Effective August 1, 1993, all Division II institutions that currently sponsor Division III nonscholarship football will be required to reclassify their football programs to Division II if they are to continue to sponsor the sport.

Because Division II rules differ significantly from Division III requirements in the areas of initial and continuing eligibility, there could be a limited number of student-athletes who initially enrolled and currently participate under Division III rules who might be denied the opportunity to fulfill their four years of football participation because of the transition to more restricted Division II rules in August of 1993.

This amendment will allow these few student-athletes to complete their football eligibility in accordance with Division III eligibility standards under which they originally enrolled and have played until now. This amendment would not apply to those student-athletes who enroll after August 1, 1993.

This proposal has the support of the Presidents Commission and Council. I urge the Division II membership to support Proposal No. 73.

Rita M. Castagna (Assumption College): I rise to speak in support of Proposal No. 73 on behalf of the Council.

This proposal gives the student-athlete who participated in a sport classified in Division III while enrolled in a Division II institution before August 1, 1993, an opportunity to complete eligibility in that sport in accordance with the Division III eligibility standards. I urge your support in the adoption of Proposal No. 73 to ensure that those

athletes who may be adversely affected as a result of this mandated reclassification.

I urge approval of Proposal No. 73.

[Proposal No. 73 (Page A-92) was approved by Division II.]

Individual Eligibility—Graduate Student

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 77 would close a loophole that has existed. It would permit a student-athlete who has graduated to continue as a full-time student at the same institution and remain eligible while taking courses for work that would lead to the equivalent of another major degree. Such individuals currently must apply for a second bachelor's degree. There are some institutions that do not allow that once you have graduated. This would allow the individual to sign up for a second major and be eligible to finish their requirements.

I don't think that we should discourage our student-athletes from graduating just so they can complete their eligibility. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 77 (Page A-96) was approved by Division II.]

Transfer Eligibility—Division II

Rita M. Castagna (Assumption College): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal simply closes a loophole that currently exists in Division II junior college transfer rules. That loophole allows a partial or nonqualifier to practice during his or her initial year of collegiate enrollment.

Here is an example: A partial or nonqualifier initially enrolls in a Division II institution. That individual is not eligible for practice or competition for his or her first year of residence at the Division II school. But if that same partial or nonqualifier initially enrolled at a two-year institution for only one semester and then transferred to a Division II institution for the second semester, that individual would be subject to the Division II two-year college transfer rule. The transfer rule says that you are not eligible for competition the first year in residence at a Division II institution unless you have either graduated from the two-year college or presented 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the two-year college. So a partial or nonqualifier who initially enrolls in a two-year college for only one semester would not be able to meet the transfer-eligibility requirements to be eligible for competition. But because the transfer rule does not prohibit that individual from practicing, a partial or nonqualifier could be eligible for practice in the second semester of his or her initial year of collegiate enrollment.

This proposal would specify that in Division II, a two-year college transfer who was a partial or nonqualifier must have attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least two semesters or three quarters to be eligible for practice and competition during the first

academic year in residence at the Division II institution.

I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 79.

[Proposal No. 79 (Page A-98) was approved by Division II.]

Outside Competition—Division II

Tom D. Morgan (California Collegiate Athletic Association): I move Proposal No. 81.

[The motion was seconded.]

In addition to the rationale presented in the Convention bulletin, we would like to add that many of us only have part-time coaches in many of these sports available during the traditional season. So in the nontraditional time, we have no time for development. We also feel that it's a financial burden to bring back these coaches in the off-season for development.

Harold J. McGee (Jacksonville State University): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee and the Council, I would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 81.

Two years ago we adopted legislation intended to reduce the overall time demands on student-athletes. Last year when this same proposal was brought forth by the Division II membership, the sponsors argued that the 1991 playing- and practice-season legislation was brought before this body because of problems and concerns that apply to Division I institutions and that the same problems and concerns do not necessarily apply to Division II. The adoption of this proposal will remove the limitations on the number of contests a student-athlete may participate in by permitting a student-athlete to participate in noncollegiate competition during the academic year.

The steering committee continues to believe that if this legislation is adopted, it will encourage the formation of outside teams and we will not have any control over the time demands made by those outside teams on those student-athletes. The steering committee does not believe that the playing- and practice-season legislation is an area where we should establish our autonomy by adopting a rule that is different than the rule in Division I. The issue is not federation. It is the time demands made on our student-athletes. It is our belief that it is important that the student-athlete not spend all the time outside his or her intercollegiate season participating on an outside team. Student-athletes should spend that time concentrating on academics and participating in other activities on the campus.

Kenneth Rebman (California State University, Hayward): I strongly urge adoption of this proposal.

I am very much aware of the concerns about inappropriate time demands placed on the student-athlete. I think that there are ways to deal with that, but unfortunately the current legislation is unfair and discriminatory in my opinion. For example, consider the soccer player who participates in track during the spring season or the volleyball player who the day after her season has ended joins the basketball team. We honor these athletes. We praise their dedication, skill and commitment. But if that same soccer player plays in a weekend tournament in the spring with his friends and relatives on a team from his ethnic community, or if the volleyball player plays in a weekend tournament with her boyfriend, what do we do? We sus-

pend them for the following season.

I think that we must be concerned about undue and improper demands upon the students. There is other legislation that will deal with that. If we fail to pass this amendment and keep the current legislation, we are sending the following message: We don't trust our coaches to do the right thing, we don't believe the athletics directors can control the coaches and we don't believe that the presidents and other administrators can keep the athletics department in line. So our solution to the problem will be to deny fundamental rights and privileges of the student-athlete. That seems like a very poor solution.

I urge adoption of this proposal.

Lawrence E. Fitzgerald (Southern Connecticut State University): I urge your support of this proposal. I will not attempt to follow the comments of my colleague from Hayward.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): I support my colleague from Hayward.

In allowing student-athletes to become general students when their season competition is concluded, we do not choose to sponsor nontraditional segments where athletes are required to be there with their coaches during that segment. We choose to allow them to be a general student. The time demands of participating in weekend soccer and volleyball matches is minimal compared to what it is in the nontraditional segment. I am not sure people understand that this is not outside teams that have daily practice sessions. It is a matter of trying to explain to men's and women's soccer athletes and volleyball athletes why their season is over in mid-November and why we do not sponsor a nontraditional segment and why they can no longer participate in any games involving their sport. That is just insane to not allow them to do what they would like to do the remainder of the academic year without the pressure of coaches being there.

There are no demands placed on them. You actually are relieving them of time. They voluntarily go because they like to play weekend soccer and volleyball. For us to deny them that just doesn't seem to make sense.

I urge you to join the 16 Division II members of California and help us get this through so that we can allow them to do something after November 15.

[Proposal No. 81 (Page A-99) was approved by Division II.]

Employment Earnings—Division II

Dorothy E. Dreyer [Wayne State University (Michigan)]: On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 84.

[The motion was seconded.]

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): On behalf of the members of the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association, I move Proposal No. 84-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal raises some concerns among Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association members. Some of the terminology in the

proposal causes concern when you say the institution's athletics interests are involved in arranging jobs. The definition of an institution's athletics interests in the Manual is very specific. For many of us located in small towns, our booster list includes virtually every establishment. I think it is going to take a definite interpretation. I would be interested in what the interpretation of "institution's athletics interests" is.

Should No. 84 pass, I have concerns about No. 84-1. I think that's why we need No. 84-1. I think among football and basketball student-athletes, many of whom are on full grant-in-aid at our institutions, real abuses in phantom jobs will be created. I am concerned about phantom jobs. I also am concerned about the interpretation on the definition of athletics interests in communities.

Ed B. Harris (Missouri Western State College): I also am a member of the MIAA. I rise to speak against Proposal No. 84-1.

It is time to move away from Division I interpretations. I think it is important that we do allow these young men and women to work. There is time for our athletes to work. I do not believe we should exclude football and basketball players. I do agree that there can be abuses. But there can be abuses in volleyball, softball or elsewhere. If we truly are concerned about the student-athlete, let's pass this without the amendment.

Gene A. Carpenter (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): I certainly agree with the second speaker. I very much disagree with the first one.

It is time we take the stigma off of football and men and women's basketball in Division II. We are so much unlike Division I. I think we need to look at our roles as Division II athletics administrators and treat our students all the same.

[Proposal No. 84-1 (Page A-102) was defeated by Division II.]

Ms. Dreyer: The Division II Steering Committee believes that student-athletes can earn off-campus employment income in excess of a full grant, provided that neither the athletics department staff members or representatives of the institution's athletics interests are involved in arranging that employment. The steering committee is sponsoring this legislation because of your responses to the survey that we conducted in the fall of 1991. The results of that survey were reported to you during the business session last year. Of the 134 respondents, 61.9 percent of you agreed that off-campus employment income should not be included in determining whether Division II students' financial aid exceeds the full grant-in-aid. This proposal would allow Division II student-athletes to work during the academic year without having employment earnings count against a full grant.

The steering committee believes this legislation benefits the Division II athlete. I urge you to vote for its adoption.

Mr. Harris: I asked for an interpretation of this. An institution's athletics interests at the present time even includes people who have purchased season tickets. So this does include a lot of people. At some point we are going to need to look into that because in a lot of our small communities, most everyone at least has season tickets.

[Proposal No. 84 (Page A-101) was approved by Division II.]

Honorary Academic Awards—Division II

Harold J. McGee (Jacksonville State University): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move Proposal No. 89.

[The motion was seconded.]

Last year we adopted legislation that excluded honorary academic awards and research grants from the determination of the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid or cost of attendance for a student-athlete. The steering committee is concerned about the potential abuse that could result by some student-athletes receiving funds in excess of their educational expenses and about the effect this legislation may have on other financial aid recipients. When we voted on this proposal last year, the steering committee did not speak in opposition to it.

On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I ask that you vote to rescind our actions of last year and vote in favor of Proposal No. 89. Allowing some student-athletes to receive institutional financial aid in excess of the cost of education represents an erosion of the Association's basic principle of financial aid found in the constitution.

I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 89.

Stan Aldridge (Georgia College): I am opposed to Proposal No. 89 from the standpoint of maximum scholarships that are required by sports. We have reduced the maximum number of allowable scholarships of many sports. If we count honorary academic awards toward the maximum number of scholarships, which we will if we include it as countable aid, then we will force the coaches to make a choice between good academic students and a walk-on who is not receiving any aid in order to stay within the maximum number of scholarships. I think coaches will do this.

I encourage you to vote against Proposal No. 89.

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): I also am opposed to No. 89.

We just passed an action that will allow student-athletes to work and receive wages that would put their aid in excess of their full grant-in-aid. My concerns remain on that legislation. As my colleague from the MIAA explained, I am not sure how we are going to handle athletics interests in our communities. But this is legislation in which a student-athlete has earned an academic scholarship or grant-in-aid based upon their academic performance. I can't believe that now we are going to count this against them and not let them go in excess and in the previous legislation we will.

Diane Husic (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): I also oppose this legislation. I agree with the previous speaker.

There are many examples in which we might have research grants awarded to some of our top students who are both athletes and scientists who could no longer receive grant money under this without having it count toward their athletics scholarships, which is not even closely related.

[Proposal No. 89 (Page A-105) was defeated by Division II.]

Financial Aid—Division II Men's Lacrosse

Merlin Thompson (Queens College (New York)): I move Proposal No. 90.

[The motion was seconded.]

The rationale is given in the Official Notice. To repeat it would be repetitious, so I will leave it as it is.

Robert E. Hartwell (Adelphi University): I am opposed to this legislation.

I ask the membership to look at the Division II philosophy. If this particular proposal was passed, what would it lead to? I urge you to oppose this.

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): I would like to echo the statements of the gentleman from Adelphi. Look at this from a philosophical point of view.

[Proposal No. 90 (Page A-106) was defeated by Division II.]

Maximum Awards—Division II

Richard A. Johanninger (Washburn University of Topeka): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 91.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal was developed as a result of the survey conducted by the steering committee in the fall of 1991. The results of the survey indicated that the Division II membership felt that one of its main problems in dealing with NCAA legislation was the administrative burden of keeping up with all the paperwork. One of the areas that was most frequently expressed as being overly burdensome was financial aid.

While the steering committee felt that some paperwork is necessary to stay in compliance with the intent and integrity of the legislation, we did think that there were some areas where we could suggest some changes that may help alleviate some of the administrative burden. We submit this proposal as an alternative to the maximum award limitation in each sport because we feel that it will be much easier to calculate equivalencies if those numbers are rounded off. The steering committee does not feel that all the proposed equivalency figures were rounded off in the manner that we originally intended. Men's lacrosse should be changed from 10.8 to 10.5, not 11.0 as reflected in Proposal No. 91.

If this proposal is adopted, the steering committee intends to propose legislation at the post-Convention Council meeting through the Council's authority to adopt legislation that is consistent with the original intent of the proposal.

I urge you to vote for Proposal No. 91.

Thomas J. Kearns (Northern Kentucky University): Please explain why it would be easier and save time for our athletics department to compare the equivalencies in cross country if the limit was 12.5 rather than 12.6? We have to make the same calculation. There is no savings in this. This is frivolous.

Mr. Ceddia: No one from the steering committee chooses to respond and neither does the chair.

Cynthia E. Ryder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): I agree with the previous speaker. My financial aid director knows how to use a calculator.

Also, in specific relationship to women's sports, if No. 91 were to

pass, Division II field hockey would decrease from 6.3 to 6.0 and skiing would go from 6.3 to 6.0. In a time when the Association is at least giving lip service toward gender equity, the reduction of even three-tenths of a scholarship is a reduction in women's opportunities. Frankly, I don't buy it.

[Proposal No. 91 (Page A-107) was defeated by Division II.]

Playing and Practice Seasons

Keith Williams (University of California, Davis): I move Proposal No. 96 on behalf of the West Coast Conference.

[The motion was seconded.]

The need for this amendment stems from inequity as a result of recent restructuring legislation per Bylaw 20.9.3.2.1. With Council approval, institutions are permitted to designate one men's sport and one women's sport in which the NCAA does not sponsor championships to meet divisional sports-sponsorship criteria.

However, these sports must meet the requirements of Bylaw 17 in regard to their length of practice and playing seasons. Currently, those sports in which the NCAA does not sponsor championships must count postseason championships against their practice and playing season, while the NCAA championship sports may exempt one postseason championship from their practice and playing seasons.

This amendment will establish the same practice and playing season exemption for nonchampionship sports that is permitted for championship sports.

[Proposal No. 96 (Page A-110) was approved by Division II.]

Conference Exception—Division II Basketball

Tom D. Morgan (California Collegiate Athletic Association): I move Proposal No. 102.

[The motion was seconded.]

The rationale is in the Official Notice. The effective date says immediately. That is unfair to the people we are talking to. Immediately would be the end of this current basketball season. Immediately is a misnomer.

Carol P. Powell (NCAA): There is some concern if it goes into effect immediately that it may affect the exemptions that you thought you had. They will not be exemptions at the close of this Convention if this proposal is adopted.

The Interpretations Committee has looked at this. Division interpretations of the exemptions would still apply if there was a contract in effect at the time the Official Notice was published.

We could ask the Interpretations Committee to review this proposal at its post-Convention meeting and issue an interpretation that would allow you to send in your contracts to keep the exemptions.

Elwood B. Hahn (Pacific West Conference): This is fairly specific legislation against our conference. It is very important. We are prepared to support the sponsors on this if it indeed is at the end of the season. We would have contracts, but we want to make sure about the effective date.

Ms. Powell: The effective date is immediately, which means it

would become effective at the close of the Convention tomorrow. Your exemptions would be saved if you have contracts in place for those games that you thought would no longer be exempted because of the adoption of the proposal. You could send those into the national office. Our legal counsel would review the contracts. You would be able to maintain the exemptions if you do have an existing contract.

Keith R. Phillips (Seattle Pacific University): In light of those comments, it seems to me that it is patently unfair for any member institution or group to propose legislation on the floor of this Convention that would be aimed specifically at a particular group of colleges or a conference with that kind of an interpretation. We should do a better job of screening our legislation in advance to realize those implications. I ask the membership to deny the adoption of this legislation. If it were valid and fair legislation, it could be supported at another time when it is more adequately phrased.

[Proposal No. 102 (Page A-118) was approved by Division II.]

First Contest Date—Cross Country, Field Hockey and Water Polo
Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I move Proposal No. 103.

[The motion was seconded.]

Football and women's volleyball already are covered by separate legislation. Last year at this time, soccer adopted the first Saturday in September as the first date for the fall playing season. This legislation simply makes it consistent with all the rest of the fall sports. It brings them all into line and permits utilization of Labor Day weekend.

[Proposal No. 103 (Page A-118) was approved by Division II.]

Maximum Dates of Competition—Divisions I and II Cross Country

Keith Williams (University of California, Davis): I move Proposal No. 104 on behalf of the West Coast Conference.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment resolves an inequity in men's and women's cross country as a result of restructuring legislation. The rationale as stated in the Official Notice is clear. This amendment simply establishes a nontraditional cross country season for those institutions that do not sponsor track and field to meet the needs of their students.

It is consistent with the regulations and opportunities in other sports. I encourage your support.

[Proposal No. 104 (Page A-119) was approved by Division II.]

Spring Football—Division II

Douglas T. Porter (Fort Valley State College): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move Proposal No. 106.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal simply clarifies that the same daily and hourly limitations that apply during the football-playing season are applicable during the spring-football practice period. This is consistent with the goals of the 1991 reform agenda that placed limitations on the time student-athletes are required to participate in countable athletically related activity.

I urge you to vote for the adoption of Proposal No. 106.

[Proposal No. 106 (Page A-121) was approved by Division II.]

Golf Practice Round—Time Limits

Terry Wanless (University of North Dakota): I move Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am not sure everybody understands the intent of this legislation. As I understand it, during practice rounds the day before a tournament, oftentimes coaches are forced to leave their squads at the golf course in order to not exceed the 20 hours per week. I think that is a dangerous situation when coaches leave their kids on the course. I think this legislation is consistent with the three hours that they are requesting for countable activity on a practice round. We are not talking about Monday through Thursday. We basically are talking about the day before a contest because oftentimes you cannot dictate the length of that practice round. You could be out there sometimes as high as six or seven hours. If you count that time into your allowable number of hours, it is very difficult for a coach to do his job.

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): On behalf of the Council, I wish to speak in opposition to this proposal.

While it may seem like an innocuous proposal, it could potentially increase the amount of time a student-athlete in golf spends on the sport, which is contrary to the recent reforms to reduce time demands on student-athletes. Every effort to increase the time spent by student-athletes in their sport no matter how small represents an erosion of the reform movement.

Under the current legislation, a practice round of golf must include the weekly limit of 20 hours. However, under this proposal, a practice round before a tournament would only count as three hours, regardless of its duration. Therefore, a practice round that lasts four or five or seven hours would only be counted as three for purposes of the weekly limit.

On behalf of the Council, I urge you to defeat this proposal.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): I rise in support of Proposal No. 107.

All of our other coaches have control of their practice opportunities and the time. The problem with the pretournament practice rounds is that coaches don't have control of the schedule. There may be 20 teams practicing. If at three hours they have to walk off the course, they may be at a competitive disadvantage.

I think we just need to use some common sense, not an effort to strike down the reform movement.

Jerry Hrciar (Cameron University): I also speak in favor of this and support the previous speaker's comments.

I have coached for 18 years. Once you have made the plans to be gone for the day, it doesn't save any class time. You already have missed a class for that day anyway, so you are not saving time. Most of those are on Sundays anyway.

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-122) was approved by Division II.]

Maximum Dates of Competition—Gymnastics

Rita M. Castagna (Assumption College): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 109.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will provide for the same number of permissible dates of competition in Division II gymnastics that currently exists in Divisions I and III. I urge you to vote for its adoption.

Keith Phillips (Seattle Pacific University): On behalf of the Pacific West Conference, Texas Woman's University and institutions in our conferences that sponsor gymnastics, we ask for your support in clarifying and correcting these numbers.

[Proposal No. 109 (Page A-123) was approved by Division II.]

Maximum Dates of Competition—Skiing

Rita M. Castagna (Assumption College): I move adoption of Proposal No. 111.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal also will provide for the same number of permissible dates of competition in Division II skiing that currently exists in Divisions I and III. On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I urge you to vote for Proposal No. 111.

[Proposal No. 111 (Page A-125) was approved by Division II.]

Preseason Soccer Scrimmages—Division II

Ollie Bowman (Hampton University): On behalf of the steering committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 112.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would allow Division II institutions to play up to three soccer scrimmages or exhibition games before the institution's first scheduled scrimmage. The scrimmage would take place during the preseason practice period and count in an institution's contest limits. Currently in Division II, we only can play scrimmages after our first soccer contest. Adoption of this proposal would allow Division II rules to be consistent with the rules adopted last year for Divisions I and III.

I urge the Convention's adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 112 (Page A-125) was approved by Division II.]

Women's Volleyball—Preseason Alumni Match

Deborah Chin (University of New Haven): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 114.

[The motion was seconded.]

The rationale that is in the Official Notice clearly exemplifies what we want to do. There is no additional competition, just the opportunity for schools to allow their alumni to participate against their teams before the season starts.

[Proposal No. 114 (Page A-127) was approved by Division II.]

Local Sports Clubs

Charles N. Lindemann (Humboldt State University): On behalf of the Council and Recruiting Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 115.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will eliminate a gap in existing legislation concerning the involvement of basketball-coaching staff members in local basketball team activities.

Current legislation prohibits basketball coaches from being in-

involved with AAU teams. But current Bylaw 13.12.2.4 would allow such activities with a local sports club team. It was the clear intent when the previous legislation was enacted to prohibit coaching-staff members from being involved in local and area teams. But other applicable language was not amended. This legislation will not affect any other sport besides Division I and Division II men's and women's basketball. The Interpretations Committee recently determined that if such legislation was enacted, the restriction would not apply to other institutional staff members.

[Proposal No. 115 (Page A-128) was approved by Division II, motion to reconsider defeated.]

Recruiting—Telephone Calls

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): I move Proposal No. 116.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to provide a coach an opportunity to call a prospect en route for a visit if he is being delayed. Right now, the legislation mandates that the prospect only can be called once you reach the city limits of the prospect's home community. If the coach is running late, it would permit him or her to make the call.

[Proposal No. 116 (Page A-128) was approved by Division II.]

Recruiting—Contacts

Charles A. Eberle (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 119.

[The motion was seconded.]

Our conference does not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent. We allow individual institutions in our conference to do so. We have situations in our conference—and I am sure there may be other institutions with similar situations—where we have some schools at a disadvantage. We should consider this legislation to allow those particular schools that do not belong the same advantages as far as contacts after the signing.

[Proposal No. 119 (Page A-131) was approved by Division II.]

Evaluations—Division II Women's Basketball

Jane Meier (Northern Kentucky University): I move Proposal No. 128.

[The motion was seconded.]

Due to multiple job responsibilities of coaches, small coaching staffs and limited recruiting budgets, basketball coaches are not able or unwilling to travel to national AAU championships to recruit. This legislation will allow coaches to maximize resources and opportunities to recruit at local, state and regional competitions in the geographical area. This legislation does not increase an evaluation period. It allows for more recruiting opportunities in the established recruiting calendar.

I solicit your support.

[Proposal No. 128 (Page A-140) was approved by Division II.]

Women's Basketball Scheduling Requirements—Division II

Dorothy E. Dreyer (Wayne State University (Michigan)): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of

Proposal No. 138.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Division II Steering Committee believes Division II member institutions should make the same commitment in scheduling their women's basketball contests as they do in their men's basketball contests. Under current Division II membership requirements, there is no women's basketball scheduling requirement. This proposal would specify that Division II member institutions must play at least 50 percent of their women's basketball games in an academic year against members of Division I or Division II.

The steering committee believes that the adoption of this proposal will serve to strengthen Division II membership requirements and will show a stronger commitment to the philosophy and development of Division II women's basketball programs.

I urge your adoption of Proposal No. 138.

[Proposal No. 138 (Page A-150) was approved by Division II.]

Official Visit—Academic Transcript

Charles J. Bertram (University of Southern Indiana): I would like to move Proposal No. 125 to hear some discussion concerning it because I think there would be some advantages to having this academic information available before we have students on campus.

[The motion was seconded.]

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): I certainly have no problem with any institution in the country that wants to require substantive material to ensure that prospects are the kinds of people they would accept in their school. But to mandate this for all institutions just does not seem to make a lot of sense to me.

[Proposal No. 125 (Page A-136) was defeated by Division II.]

[The meeting was recessed for 20 minutes.]

REPORT

Mr. Ceddia: We would like to begin the second phase of this morning's session. We have a report from the championships committee and a panel discussion on matters affecting Division II championships.

It is my pleasure to introduce the chair of the championships committee, Jerry Hughes, who is a former member of the NCAA Council and a former Division II vice-president.

Championships Committee

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University). I'm going to start this session by presenting the championships report. I then will move into the panel discussion.

The Division II Championships Committee has the overall responsibility to administer Division II championship programs, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee. Specifically, the duties of the championships committee are as follows: 1. Make recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding the subsidy for the conduct of Division II championships; 2. Supervise qualification and/or selection procedures for those events; 3. Maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations in areas of safety, financial impact and image of the sport; 4. Approve recommendations for the

various sports committees regarding administration of those championships; 5. Process other issues related to the administration of events, and 6. Act for the Executive Committee as the final authority regarding championship matters in Division II that are subject to appeal to the Executive Committee.

During 1991-92, I served as the chair of the championships committee. The committee was comprised of the following individuals: Rita Castagna, director of athletics, Assumption College; Tony Ceddia, president of Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania; Jim Fallis, director of athletics, Lake Superior State University, and Noel Olson, commissioner of the North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. Jim and Tony's terms on the committee will end this month. I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to them for their contributions to the committee. Tony's replacement will be Chuck Lindemann, director of athletics at Humboldt State University. I would like at this time to welcome him to the committee. Jim's position will be filled by an individual from the Council to be named at the post-Convention Council meeting.

During the 1991-92 year, a total of 561 teams and 4,669 student-athletes competed in 11 Division II championships. Sixty-eight percent of the membership participated in a championship competition; 156 of the 227 member institutions were involved. Championship participants were reimbursed \$2.3 million in transportation expenses and approximately \$1.3 million in per diem. The total expense absorbed by the Association for the conduct of the Division II championship program, which included game expenses, transportation and per diem, was \$3.4 million.

The major issues discussed by the championships committee during the past year were the comprehensive review of the championships program and the results of a survey regarding regionalization, automatic qualification and the enhancement fund. I will not elaborate on these topics since that is the thrust of our panel discussion.

Other actions taken by the committee are reported in The NCAA News after the committee meets. However, I will attempt to highlight some of the policies and procedures adopted by the committee that are specific to Division II championships as opposed to the total NCAA championship program. During the May meeting, the committee reviewed a report regarding championship site selection and related policies such as pairing of teams for preliminary rounds of competition and transportation policies.

The committee determined that institutions must travel by ground transportation if the distance from their campus to the competition site is 400 miles or less. This was a change from a previous 250-mile limit. It also agreed to discourage sports committees from selecting sites that require commuter or ground transportation outside the metropolitan areas of airports. In addition, the committee encouraged sports committees to select championship sites at least three years in advance, instructed sports committees to strictly adhere to the regionalization policy that requires teams to be selected and paired within their region and revised current policy regarding the

pairing of teams within the same conference to specify that in the event that more than three teams are selected from the same conference, the lowest seeded team may be paired with the team from an adjacent region only if such movement does not result in air travel that would not otherwise have occurred.

The committee also reviewed during the May meeting the rating systems used by sports committees to evaluate potential championships participants. In an attempt to provide some consistency in the systems that are being used, the committee took the following actions: 1. Specified that the point value awarded for a loss against a Division I opponent should not exceed the point value of a win against a Division II opponent; 2. Agreed that institutions should be given an opportunity to schedule a predetermined number of games that would not count in the calculation of a rating and asked sports committees to report back, and 3. Agreed that national polls and rankings should not be used as a basis for selecting teams.

During a review of the sports sponsorship numbers for the 1992-93 academic year, it was noted that 44 institutions sponsored wrestling, which is below the minimum 20-percent requirement of 45 to maintain a Division II championship. If the sponsorship does not meet the 20-percent requirement as of September 30, 1993, the championship will be eliminated after the 1993 tournament. Other championships that are close to the 20-percent requirement are men's swimming with 45 institutions sponsoring that sport; women's swimming with 47 institutions; ice hockey, 14; men's lacrosse, 24, and field hockey, 20. All were below the minimum-sponsorship level, but because of one of the provisions of Bylaw 18, these sports are protected until the 1993-94 academic year.

The committee reviewed questions regarding the status of ice hockey, men's lacrosse and the field hockey championships, particularly what the future of those events will be due to the low sponsorship numbers. It was the intent of the Division II Steering Committee that when legislation pertaining to membership restructuring took effect in September 1993 with compliance required in the 1993-94 academic year, that those championships would be required to meet existing sponsorship requirements for their continuation. If any of these championships do not meet the minimum 20-percent requirement, after a two-year period they will be discontinued. There exists some confusion in the Association's bylaws regarding this matter. The committee will review amendments during its May 1993 meeting to clarify the issue.

In a related issue, the committee reviewed Bylaw 20.4.3. The provision of this bylaw permits Division II and Division III institutions to classify in Division I one men's sport other than football and basketball, any one women's sport other than basketball, and in any single sport in which the NCAA championships opportunity is the only national collegiate championship. The committee will review proposed legislation to ensure that if the ice hockey, men's lacrosse or field hockey championships are eliminated, the student-athletes in these sports will have championship opportunities in either the Division I or National Collegiate Championship.

If you have any questions regarding the work of the championships committee, do not hesitate to contact any committee member or Dennis Poppe, NCAA director of championships who serves as a staff liaison to the Division II committee.

PANEL DISCUSSION

Mr. Hughes: Now I believe we are ready to begin the panel discussion portion of this session. The issues are the comprehensive championship review, regionalization, automatic qualification and the enhancement fund.

I would like to introduce the panelists: Jim Battle, Virginia Union University; Rita Castagna, Assumption College; Lynn Dorn, North Dakota State University; Jim Fallis, Lake Superior State University; Don Lubbers, Grand Valley State; Noel Olson, North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, and Bob Vanatta, Sunshine State Conference.

The championships committee is going to take the four major topics and discuss those items. The panelists will give their thoughts and their committee's thoughts. After everyone has made his or her presentation, we will open the floor to discussion.

Championships Review

First, I will outline the overall championships review program. This past spring, we surveyed the membership about the services of the Association. The championships program is the priority of the Association relative to the other programs and services. That was the top priority as far as the membership was concerned about the services the Association provides.

It also was noted that men's and women's championships should be treated equitably in terms of field sizes, per diem allowance and travel party expenses. If you will note the recommendations of the championships committee that were in a recent issue of The NCAA News in regard to field sizes for the 1993-94 women's championships and the increases in several women's championships, you will see that the Division II Championships Committee and Executive Committee have addressed those issues.

Championship formats should place an emphasis on quality of competition for elite teams of student-athletes and consideration should be given to sponsorship ratios when determining field sizes. The Division II membership before this meeting was 223 member institutions. Effective September 1, there will be 26 more institutions, which will bring the membership of Division II to 249 institutions. Four years ago when I was vice-president, the membership of Division II was 189. So you can see the growth of the Division II membership.

It obviously became very difficult for the steering committee because there are some sports that really need bracket expansion. But with limited resources, it became very difficult to come to any logical way to achieve bracket expansion. So rather than determining which committee made the best political plea at our feet, Divisions I, II, III arrived at a formula by which the percent of the membership sponsoring a sport will determine field size. For example, if 95 percent of the Division II membership sponsors a sport, there would be a 32-

team bracket. Men's and women's basketball falls in that category. If 85 percent of the membership sponsors a sport, the bracket size is 28 and we go on down from that. All of this was in the News article. So once 95 percent of the membership sponsors a sport, that sport will receive a 32-team bracket. We go all the way down from 95, 85, 75, 65, 55 and so on.

The last thing we discussed during the review process was that while host institutions should be held accountable for some major financial responsibility, revenue generation should not necessarily be the determining factor for selection of championships sites.

At this point, I would like to present Noel Olson to present the regionalization concept.

Regionalization

Noel W. Olson (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): If you will look on page two of the sheets that you received, it tells you about the regionalization policy. I am going to read that because it is so well done. I believe it explains everything. Then maybe I'll highlight some things from my personal experiences on sports committees and the Championships Committee that emphasize the need for regionalization.

Obviously, I am very much a proponent of the regionalization concept. It states that commencing with the 1993-94 championships, all governing sports committees for Division II championships in which teams are selected shall assign team berths by region, either equally or according to criteria that should consider the number of participating institutions within a region and the performance of these regional teams in previous championships. Such allocations shall be published in the respective championships handbooks. The number of teams allocated to a region may be adjusted by the governing sports committees during the selection process if there is conclusive data. Of course, that means things like head-to-head competition or common opponents. In my mind, you better have a pretty strong case to permit the replacement of a team in one region with a team from another region. This policy pertains to all team championships and individual-team championships in cross country, golf and tennis.

The championships committee has asked all sports committees to review their method of handling the selection process and how they will implement it for the 1993-94 season. Many of the committees' plans are very, very well done and complete. In the May 1993 meeting, we probably will make final decisions on whether the implementation plan of each sports committee is acceptable.

Personally, a word that has become part of my vocabulary lately is fairness. Fairness seems to be used in racial and ethnic and gender issues rather regularly. Those issues call for fairness very loudly. But so does the Division II championship selection process.

The factors that have led Division II to the regionalization concept in my opinion are these: Not enough comparison on an interregional basis. We don't have the privileges of Division I to travel all over the country and then develop a computer program that will easily tell us who the best 32 or 28 teams are in the nation in our respective sports. It just is impossible. How do we know that somebody from

the South Central Region is better than somebody from the East Region?

When we attempt to gain this kind of comparison, we are traveling all over the country. It smacks against the very concept that we have worked hard for in Division II—cost containment. Division II always will suffer in this area. We simply cannot afford the travel for this type of comparison. Probably the most important factor in regionalization is that it really works.

Once a sports committee bites the bullet, as men's basketball did four years ago when we first started looking at this, I really believe that you will find that the system does work. The constituency will be much happier in the long run as long as it knows in advance what the criteria are. From my experiences on the men's basketball committee, I can give you some insights that might be helpful to you. Four years ago when we started looking at this, we immediately began to realize that we just didn't have enough intraregion competition. The polls that we had were nice. They were pretty good for publicity purposes, but they really didn't reflect the top 20 teams in the nation because nobody could prove that they were.

I never will forget when we had two or three teams that had been ranked in the final national poll that didn't make the final selection. That was a little embarrassing. And so it became a very, very difficult thing. That was one very significant factor that made me feel that regionalization was important. Since we went to the regional concept four years ago, the men's basketball committee has made only one adjustment of moving a team into one region and out of another region. We receive much less grief from the membership. It was a much easier selection process. Slowly but surely, I think people recognize that this was the only solid and good method.

I remember sitting in a television uplink interview with Dennis Poppe (NCAA Director of Championships) before we did this. We had a ton of questions. But when we explored the regionalization concept, it became much easier to justify. Is it perfect? No, it is not perfect. Very few systems are. Is it the best possible way? Yes, I believe it is. We came as close as we could to making people fit into neat packages in a comfortable manner.

I have to tell a story about an incident that occurred. The chair of the New England advisory committee, Al Shields, and I were discussing the merits of various teams across the country. I told Al that he certainly couldn't believe that teams from New England were as good as teams from another region. He said, "I really believe that, Noel, I really do believe that." Those teams proceeded to win two out of the next three national championships in New England. I changed my tune. I began to respect every region.

I realize that not everything is the same in terms of the sports that we have. There is a lot of differences. Then what parameters could we accept as a championships committee within the concept of regionalization? I believe sports committees have flexibility in establishing parameters because of fewer teams in a particular region. Maybe they deserve fewer selections. For example, volleyball with a 28-team field is not going to come out with an even four teams in

every region with eight regions. Consequently, there will have to be some regions with fewer selections. Selections can be based on the numbers of teams as well as historically proven quality. We have pockets in our country that have quality in certain sports. That certainly could be in this framework if not overdone. Conclusive data also could allow you to actually make changes during the selection process. We hope this won't occur very often. Every time it occurs, you have to justify it. When you have to justify something, it becomes more difficult. That is why when the men's basketball committee finally decided not to make any changes, they were a lot happier.

Women's team sports have the most difficulty in accepting the regionalization concept. I suspect that that's probably because certain parts of our country have not developed women's athletics to the level that others have. I suppose that's part of the whole gender-equity situation. But I believe that our new bracket formulas that Jerry mentioned will be an aid to help team sports like volleyball, softball and basketball fit the concept better.

The new concept that we believe will be adopted by the Executive Committee has some great merit because it will allow us to increase our brackets. For example, two extra teams in each region of a 32-team bracket could actually allow us to possibly have 48 teams at no expense to the NCAA. I think that will help because it will give us a few more numbers to each region and assure that we don't miss anybody. The chance to participate for some of these teams—particularly women's teams in certain areas where they may not have proven to be as strong—will be very, very essential. With new members flocking into Division II, we must give championship opportunities to all. Regionalization is the only way to do this. Intraregional play is a lot easier. By doing this, travel is not so great. I believe without any question we can then clearly learn who are the best teams in our region.

Realignment, the last thing that fits into this regional concept is one of my real areas of concern. We have to take hold of this thing. We have to bite the bullet and do a lot of realigning in all of our sports. I have looked at men's basketball because I was on the committee for a number of years. We have stalled because of many reasons. For one reason, we have been waiting for all the new teams to come in. We can't stall any longer. We have to immediately start realigning all of our sports. Not everybody agrees with me on this, but I really feel that that is an important factor. We have a large number of Division II schools in the southeast area of our country the South Region, South Atlantic and even Eastern Seaboard. When we get further west, we have a lot of space in between. We really have to take a hard look at that. Numbers of new schools will make this even more essential. Cost and gender equity probably will dictate that we cap bracket size at 32 for a long time to come. This makes the regional concept even more important. Fairness demands that we seriously take the need for regionalization of our selection process.

Mr. Hughes: I'd now like Rita to discuss automatic qualification.

Automatic Qualification

Rita M. Castagna (Assumption College): There are two issues in

question about automatic qualification with which we have to concern ourselves. One is the establishment of consistent criteria that all sports committees are required to follow. The second concern is whether or not the privilege of automatic qualification should be eliminated due to the implementation of regionalization.

On the first issue, with the exception of Bylaw 31.3.4.1(d), most conferences meet the requirements of Bylaw 31.3.4 relating to the criteria necessary in receiving automatic qualification. Bylaw 31.3.4.1(d) states that competition in the applicable sport must be of sufficient quality to warrant automatic qualification. The criteria for determining the quality of competition is won-lost record and strength of both the conference as a whole and its individual members. Objective data can be used to evaluate won-lost records. However, various methods are used subjectively to evaluate strength of schedules. It is at this point in the sports committee's evaluation procedures that inconsistencies develop. Some committees may employ a conference's Division II record. Others may use a conference's success against top teams or perhaps previous championship records or a comparison of the top half versus the bottom half of a conference. There are as many as 15 other criteria used among the sports committees to determine the automatic qualifiers. We have to come to a better consensus of how we are going to choose automatic qualifiers through this criteria. In order to continue with automatic qualification, there probably ought to be more consistent criteria developed to aid in the selection process among sports committees.

On the second issue of whether automatic qualification should be eliminated due to the implementation of regionalization, there very well may be an incompatible situation between automatic qualification and regionalization in some instances. For example, there will be a conflict in some regions if there are more conferences than berths available for teams. The obvious answer is realignment to ensure that there are not more conferences than berths. However, this might not always be possible. Also, sports committees are instructed to select teams on a regional basis. But the criteria used to evaluate automatic qualification is based on national data.

So our points of discussion could focus on these two issues—the establishment of consistent criteria used by all sports committees and the possible elimination of automatic qualifiers. It is hoped that open discussion will bring to light the direction that we must go. Those are things to think about while we discuss whether we should maintain qualifiers or what we should do about automatic qualifications.

Mr. Hughes: Next I'd like to discuss the enhancement fund.

Enhancement Fund

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): I want to give you a bit of a history about the enhancement fund.

In 1990, the NCAA signed a seven-year contract with CBS to televise the Division I basketball championship. We now are in the third year of that television contract. The Special Advisory Committee to Review Recommendations Regarding Distribution of Revenues conducted an extensive survey of the membership. Division II as well as Division I and III members were asked to provide input. After exten-

sive review of the suggestions, the Division II Championships Committee recommended the formula as you know it today.

The distribution plan is designed to be equitable and make distribution easy to understand and administer. It is modeled after some of the major points in the Division I plan. It was felt that using half of the money for distribution directly to the members would provide immediate infusion in each of our programs. The other half distributed to the conferences was going to provide a large percentage of the membership with the ability to have some say over how the funds would be used in strengthening and developing conference services. Many of you have implemented new service or have been able to start up some badly needed ones with these funds. It was the sense of the championship committee to have conference funding reflect success in the men's basketball tournament, similar to that of the Division I tournament. Thus, the six-year rotating formula was used.

Recent concerns about additional dollars coming in this year have led to a number of questions about other uses for the money. Most of the questions I have heard were discussed by the committee while this process was being developed. The committee thought that keeping the program simple and easy to understand and administer was essential. Adding programs and reducing the funds distributed by the existing process would increase the administrative burden in implementing such programs. The result would be an increase in administrative costs versus funds available. It also was felt that the Executive Committee, which reviews all expenditures on an annual basis, felt comfortable with our original distribution plan and therefore would continue to approve the enhancement moneys for Division II for the remainder of the contract. I also would like to point out that as a result of the CBS contract we benefited with increased per diems and travel parties for Division II championships. While not all of us have had the opportunity to participate every year at a championship, we all have had the benefit of the catastrophic insurance premium being paid by the Association since the inception of the contract.

Early on, the committee realized that there was going to be a need for some basic guidelines in the administration of the fund. I would like to go over these basic guidelines. If a conference falls below the six-member requirement, the basketball moneys will be retained by the conference for a one-year period, after which the funds shall be retained by the institutions that earned the units. If a conference disbands, the member institution shall retain its basketball pool shares. If an institution leaves the conference, realigns or becomes an independent and its original conference remains in operation, the units it earned remains with the conference that it left. If an independent institution joins the conference, it retains the units it earned as an independent before the date it was elected to join the conference. Any units earned after that date incur to the basketball fund. No conference shall lose its units in the basketball pool if it is represented in the tournament by an institution that is later declared ineligible, whereby the number of units would be reduced to one. However, if more than one institution represented the confer-

ence, the ineligible institution's units would be vacated.

Since the establishment of these guidelines, we have had a minimal number of appeals. A case book that handles unique cases that have come up was developed. I will be happy to answer any questions concerning that later.

Finally, on a personal note, I have been on the championships committee for three years. I was there when the contract was signed. It was an exciting and interesting time. And while the Division II Championships Committee is responsible for the administration of the enhancement fund, it was through the effort of our Division II Championships Committee Chair, Jerry Hughes, with strong support from our present secretary-treasurer, B.J. Skelton, and President Judy Sweet that we received these funds. Division II needs to know that these three provided the support that we needed at the Executive Committee.

Mr. Hughes: Each of our panelists will discuss any of these four issues.

OPEN DISCUSSION

Lynn Dorn (North Dakota State University): On behalf of the women's sports committees I would like to thank you for this opportunity to share our concerns and reactions to the regionalization concept. I also would like to thank the championships committee. Its deliberation in reevaluating the championship brackets, which expanded opportunities for women, per diem and travel squads was very reflective of its commitment to fairness. So, Jerry, thank you very much on behalf of the women's sports committees.

The challenge that confronts members of sports committees is to ensure quality competitive experience and to assure access. Unfortunately, some of our coaches feel that this might be mutually exclusive. So I wish to present seven items that might ensure the attainment of this goal. As Noel said, there is a variety of opportunities that have been extended to women at the institutional level and perhaps pockets of strong teams really do exist. Given those parameters, I am hopeful that the following seven ideas might assist our coaches in meeting item C, as found in your memo.

First, I think there is confusion among women coaches as to whether or not regionalization exists. As each of us knows, it does. It is our obligation as administrators to make certain that coaches are aware of this concept. Doubts exist as to how they schedule. Is it more important to schedule at the regional level or is it valid to schedule outside the region? To assure them that their needs will be met through the regionalization concept is very important.

Secondly, we must make sure that coaches have input about the selection process criteria, that they are going to be provided an open means of communication between sport committee members, that they have input about realignment, and that they are going to be able to assess their needs and communicate them. Creativity is very important for sports committee members. Evaluating the survey and assessing membership needs are primary goals of each sports committee member. But this has to be achieved through parameters of flexibility and creativity.

The third point is that it is important that the coaches are aware of the selection process. For example, the Women's Volleyball Committee requests a weekly report from each institution that sponsors Division II volleyball. Unfortunately, many institutions did not respond. As a result, the committee was not able to use that institution in the evaluation of the weekly poll. Please make sure our coaches understand that we can function better on behalf of their student-athletes with their cooperation and to make certain that they are aware of the criteria that have been established by the sport committee in the selection process. Evaluating regionalization, perhaps even as far as the second or third year, is going to be necessary. I am hopeful that we will be able to evaluate the regionalization concept and that patience will be granted to sports committee members.

Number five, it seems as though the ultimate goal of regionalization is to have equal access based upon the numbers of regions. For example, the 32-team bracket, the eight regions, four from each. But as we work toward enhancing women's resources, this may not be a reality. In fact, there may be an imbalance in the distribution of teams representing a specific sport. I am hopeful that coaches will be sensitive to that and that as administrators we will assist them in understanding.

The sixth point is that I am hopeful we can share with our local media the regionalization concept and the utilization of polls. The championships committee has determined that if an outside agency is conducting a national poll, that the sport committee will not be permitted to conduct a national poll. Information will be disseminated based upon a regional evaluation on a weekly or monthly basis. But there is a misconception with media that these national polls are conducted by NCAA sports committees. So reeducating the media about the process may enhance the sport's visibility at the regional level. To be ranked second, third or fourth in your region may give public awareness and public visibility to your sport in contrast to not being ranked in the top 20.

My final thought. It is important to philosophically examine the statement of membership within Division II. It is imperative to be consistent with that as we see new members entering Division II. We must be committed to scholarship opportunities and accessing championship opportunities for women as well as men.

Bob Vanatta (Sunshine State Conference): My comments will be from past experience based on a number of years in athletics as well as from the newly organized Division II Commissioners Association. I would like to remark about regionalization and automatic qualification. They overlap each other.

At our December meeting, the Division II Commissioners Association was informed pretty emphatically that regionalization is here to stay. This probably was the first time that many of the commissioners actually realized this. There is a problem that has been hit upon briefly on two or three different occasions. That problem is over-balance in our region, specifically in basketball championships. This gives us unequal numbers with various regions. For example, basketball sponsorship ranges from 19 to 39 within the eight regions

that we presently have. The South Atlantic with 39 is the largest. The East and South Regions have 32 each. This creates a problem. It is more or less unequal representation. I am sure that this will be solved as we go along. Our association has appointed an ad hoc committee to study realignment. This committee soon will report back to the basketball committee. We hope to be of some help to them as we move along.

In a recent survey by the basketball committee regarding realignment, 71 percent returned the survey out of approximately the 220 Division II institutions. Fifty-five percent indicated satisfaction with the present plan; 44 percent indicated lack of satisfaction. To several of us on this ad hoc committee, the 44 percent indicated that we do have a problem that needs to be studied. I know the basketball committee will do so in the future. Before regionalization can become successful, this problem of realignment must be considered.

Regarding automatic qualification, conferences are very concerned about it. I understand the championships committee is considering three options: granting automatic qualification on a regional basis, the development of consistent criteria—I think that is an absolute necessity—or the complete elimination of automatic qualification. This came up in our commissioner's meeting. We took a straw vote and about 100 percent of the commissioners felt that the elimination of automatic qualification should not become a reality. We felt that eliminating automatic qualification would lower the development of our conferences. Our basketball conference tournaments, which determine who automatically goes to the NCAA tournament, create a great deal of excitement. They also create financial help.

In 1976 and 1977, several Division I conferences were about to lose their automatic qualification. It became a real battle on the Convention floor. It was voted that all conferences in Division I at that time would receive the automatic bid as they had in the past. I think the basic philosophy was if you meet the criteria of your division, you should have the opportunity for an automatic qualification.

I know that creates a problem because as your division grows you only are giving one half of the bracket to automatic qualifiers. It creates a problem pretty quickly. But I think this can be solved. Division I gives the opportunity for more institutions to participate in the national championships, not only in basketball but throughout its sports program. The committee has considered this, but there hasn't been any conversation on that this morning. I do feel that that is a method by which we can bring in more teams to our championship because we have been told that the brackets will not be increased. Back in the 1970s, we increased brackets in Division I basketball from 32 to 48 to 54 and now finally 64.

But we don't have that luxury. I sincerely believe that the problem can be worked out with continued effort.

James F. Battle (Virginia Union University): The regionalization concept is the hot topic this morning.

The Division II Men's Basketball Committee spearheaded the regionalization concept. It is well entrenched in the Division II men's championship selection process. Athletics directors and other admin-

istrators must stress to coaches that their team's position in the regional poll is more important than their position in the national poll.

You also need to work with and encourage your local media to print the regional poll rather than to put so much emphasis on the national poll. The national poll does cause some confusion during the selection process because teams that are not in the national poll get concerned about whether or not they will be selected for postseason play in Division II men's basketball. It is important that the team be among the top four teams in the region at the end of the season. That's where the emphasis is.

My comments will be focused on the implications of the regionalization concept for the Division II men's basketball championship and do not reflect the opinions of the men's basketball committee. They reflect my own opinion and position. I will not offer any recommendations or solutions to the implications of the regionalization concept or the men's Division II basketball championship. I hope to raise some questions about issues that I think are germane to the regionalization concept and are part and parcel of the regionalization concept. They must be considered when putting the regionalization concept in practice during the selection process for the championship.

Of course one of these is automatic qualification. The question is how many teams should be permitted as automatic qualifiers in a particular region. There is wide disparity in the number of teams in regions. Some regions have more than 30 teams. Other regions have less than 20. Some conferences have from 12 to 14 members. Other conferences have six or seven. Is it equitable to give automatic qualification to a conference with six teams as compared to a conference with 12 to 14 teams? It is a lot more difficult to gain automatic qualification in a conference with 12 or 14 teams than it is in a conference with six teams. What is an equitable solution? Should it be six? Should it be eight? Should it be 10? I hope we can have some discussion from you.

The other question about automatic qualification is how many teams should be permitted as automatic qualifiers in the championship in a region on a percentage basis. Should it be 50 percent? Should it be 75 percent? Or perhaps none? That is an item that has to be dealt with on the regionalization concept.

We have seen a large number of teams coming into Division II. Is this an equitable situation during the selection process to select four teams per region? The Division II basketball championship is divided by eight regions. Four teams from each region gives you a 32-team bracket. When regions have more than 30 teams and other regions have less than 20, is it equitable to select four teams from each region? Does that give reasonable access to all of the teams that compete for the championship to postseason championship play? That is the question that has to be decided.

In regard to alignment, what about geography? How important is geography in aligning teams within regions? How about conference integrity? Is it important to keep conferences together? The survey indicated that the majority of the membership believes strongly that conferences should not be divided or split. I believe this also. When

one or two teams within a conference are located outside of the geographical boundaries of a particular region, should those one or two teams be selected in the region of the conference? Or should they be placed someplace else? I believe that those one or two teams located outside the geographical boundaries of the conference should be selected within that region. For example, Lincoln Memorial University in Tennessee is a member of the Gulf South Conference, which is located geographically in the South region. But for selection purposes, Lincoln Memorial competes in the South Atlantic region. I believe Lincoln Memorial should be selected in the South region. The Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference is located geographically in the majority in the South region. However, for selection purposes to the Division II basketball championship, the SIAC conference competes in the South Atlantic region. In fact, the SIAC jumps over a conference to get to the South Atlantic, whereas other conferences are more indigenous to the South Atlantic. Those things need to be looked at. Another question is how do you provide a reasonable access to teams that compete for the Division II championship? That raises questions of bracket size. Is a 32-team bracket in Division II basketball a reasonable number to provide reasonable access?

It seems that the proposal to expand the bracket size will not take effect. How do you enhance opportunity for participation in the Division II basketball championship without increasing the bracket size and also without increasing the cost of the championship in terms of per diem and travel allowance? A play-in system has been mentioned.

We hope that we can get some comments from the membership as to what your feelings and recommendations might be as it relates to a play-in system. We also encourage you to get in contact with your regional representative and make recommendations and comments about a possible play-in system for the Division II basketball championship.

Another question that comes to mind with the regionalization concept is once teams are selected to participate in a particular region, how many teams from a conference should compete in the championship within that region? Conferences have a tournament to determine a champion. One or perhaps two weeks later there is a possibility that those same teams that have just finished playing the conference championship are competing against each other again in a regional championship. There is the provision to have at least one team move to another region when this occurs. We hope that all championship committees will keep this in mind and avail themselves of the opportunity to do this when it exists. I hope that we can get some discussion on alignment and how important you feel it is to keep conferences and teams within the geographical boundaries of the regions in which they compete for the selection process. For automatic qualification, what is a reasonable number of teams in terms of criteria to be awarded automatic qualification? Because of the number of teams in Division II, there will come a time when there is a possibility that a region may be closed out of a possibility of automatic qualifiers.

If that happens, perhaps there should not be automatic qualifiers. We hope to get some comments about that and about the situation where you have conferences or institutions that compete outside of the geographical boundaries in which they are located.

I would like to hear your feelings about that and the possibilities for a play-in for Division II basketball.

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): Presidents are interested in championships. On behalf of my colleagues, I appreciate this invitation to speak about the subject. But presidents are not as interested in championships as coaches, athletics directors, athletics staff and participants. We just aren't as involved.

Presidents tend to concentrate on those issues in which they believe threaten the academic integrity of member institutions. In the five years I have been on the Presidents Commission, that's what I have noticed. In this whole matter of championships, there is no threat to the integrity. I think that the championship committee has done an outstanding job dealing with very difficult and sometimes convoluted matters. Although presidents are extremely interested, we tend to defer to the championship committee and to the Council on matters relating to championships.

However, there are a few concepts that the presidents have in mind. First is fairness in selection. We want fairness when our teams are looked upon. When we received this memorandum about the regionalization concept, informal polling showed that most of my colleagues like this. They think it is moving in the right direction. As far as automatic qualification, I think we are saying you solve that problem. We are not going to get into it.

The second concept that keeps coming up is fairness for women and men. In this whole process, somehow we have to work out something that both genders feel is equitable. That is not going to be easy, but it is a goal.

The third principle that comes out of our discussions is maximum participation. Some of us remember when championships were not so important. If you won your conference, you were the champion. That was enough. You didn't think beyond that. Now NCAA championships in all divisions are big things. I can't believe it. I was for automatic qualification for our conference champion, not the tournament winner. The first year we won the conference championship. Then we had to win the conference tournament to go and we did. Last year we didn't win the conference championship but we did win the tournament championship. So my coach said, "see?" I said "well, I think the other team should have gone anyway." So we are not on very good terms.

I think maximum participation is what most of us would like to see. But we are restricted by money. But I think the championship committee does a wonderful job in getting the most for the dollars. We will always urge for as much participation as we possibly can have and afford.

The fourth and last principle that we have dealt with—this one we actually discussed in our Presidents Commission Division II group—is the equitable and effective use and distribution of funds. We really

have no quarrels with what has been developed and the way it has gone. But we did talk about this final million dollars. I believe the committee is proposing to keep going on the same formula. But I do have to share with you some of the comments that came up.

First, the amount of money that goes to each institution is not too significant. It is not that big a deal. For some of you who receive those few thousand dollars, maybe it is a big deal. But generally we felt that was not too big of a deal. There was some concern when we looked at the amount of money that each of the conferences won. We look at those dollars and we know that some of the teams that have done very well are now on probation. But the comment came up that if you cheat, you get more money and other teams in your conference get more money. How does that get rectified? That was a question that was raised by the presidents.

Secondly, basketball really brings the money in, but not Division II basketball. Yet we divide the money on a basketball formula. No one is saying that is wrong. But my colleagues questioned if we should follow that particular formula.

Finally, the question was raised about spending this final million dollars on some other interests in Division II. Should we or shouldn't we? Should we have coaches clinics and athletics directors clinics?

I present to you the questions that were raised, but I can reassure you that we are not going to butt in very much. We should converse with our athletics staffs and coaches. We should discuss the championships issues among ourselves as presidents and send to the committee our recommendations. I think that we should be advisers, not major players. Major players are the presidents who serve on the championships committee.

I can't speak definitively for my colleagues, but I think the Commission's view is that the job is being done very well and that at this meeting you are going to make some suggestions. Out of our discussions, improvements will come. The matter is in very good hands. We would appreciate the opportunity to have our say once in awhile. We will make sure that the championships committee receives our views. If we want to discuss something with the membership, we will ask for that privilege again.

Mr. Hughes: We will try to answer any questions.

Howard Elwell (Gannon University): The television contract runs through 1997. The Division II enhancement fund expires this year. Is there any dialogue about getting additional funds?

Mr. Hughes: You mean the \$3 million for the continuation of the contract?

Mr. Elwell: Right.

Mr. Hughes: Yes. That's the current Executive Committee stand. They phase it in. We got \$1 million, last year we got \$2 million, this year we will get \$3 million. That will run for the life of the contract. Whether that will continue once the new contract is negotiated, I can't answer that.

Mr. Elwell: Will that be divided the way it is being divided this year?

Mr. Hughes: It currently is the Executive Committee's position to

divide it the way it currently is. However, the revenue distribution committee meets annually to possibly redistribute those moneys. They can make a redistribution. So it could be changed. I would hope it would not be, but it may be. I think in answer to President Lubber's comments, if the membership feels that something should be done differently than we are currently doing, we would like your input.

William L. Price (Norfolk State University): I have several questions.

Number one, how will the plan operate? What will be the plan's system? How would it be determined which conference will play which conference? How will the bracket be set up on the plan?

Number two. Is the distribution of funds based on the conference? I would like an explanation on that.

Charles A. Eberle (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): We are discussing the plan. We will send something to your commissioners for input. Nothing has been decided about how it would work. I am going to be chairing a subcommittee of the Division II Men's Basketball Committee to make a recommendation to our group. Anybody who has ideas as to how it should work, please get in touch with me or with anybody on the committee. We certainly will be looking at any particular ideas the membership would have as to how it should operate.

Mr. Price: I hope the committee will consider the fact that I would like to see the SIAC and CIAA in the plan. They are two predominantly black universities. I would like that to happen.

Mr. Hughes: You want to know how it is determined what amount of money the conferences get?

Mr. Price: Yes, I would.

Mr. Hughes: The share that goes to the conference is based upon your six-year rolling average of success in the men's basketball tournament. You earn units based upon a six-year rolling average. Each unit equates to X-number of dollars multiplied out. That's how your conference share is determined.

Marvin Vanover (Peach Belt Athletic Conference): You asked for comments or reactions to regional versus national selection. I certainly want to speak in favor of regional selection as opposed to national selection. I think we are doing that in basketball and Noel mentioned that that was going pretty well.

As for the elimination of the national championships and replacing them with a regional postseason competition, I haven't heard anyone from the podium address that to any great extent. I assume that there is not much support for that. I certainly want to speak in opposition to that. I think I can speak for the commissioner's association. The majority of us are opposed to that.

In a recent poll of Division II schools in the eight regions, five of the regions were satisfied with the alignment of the regions as they now exist. There were three that were opposed. It is interesting to note the three that were opposed composed 96 teams, which is about 46 percent, in terms of the number of Division II schools that are participating in basketball. The three that are opposed to it are, like

ourselves, regions that have 30 to 38 teams. You need to keep that in mind.

I would speak in favor of the play-in situation, particularly because we realize that our numbers are not going to be increased in our regions at least until we solve the gender-equity situation in the next few years. The play-in offers some opportunities. My concern is that we don't allow the play-in to decrease or keep us from the realignment process.

I would speak in favor of the realignment of the teams. We have got to balance the numbers, as Noel mentioned. I also would speak in favor of maintaining the integrity of the conference. I realize this will be a problem. But I think it is time for us to get on with the show and make some efforts in this direction.

So I am speaking in favor of the play-in only after the realignment of numbers and not in lieu of.

James K. McDonald (Edinboro University of Pennsylvania): Has any consideration been given to site selection as far as the bidding process is concerned? When you are selected to get into postseason play, it is a trying experience to try to figure out how much money you should try to bid for a site.

Would it be possible to have the Council to come up with a formula for postseason play whereby you would have a minimum bid? Then they could give consideration to the strength of the team's bidding within the region.

Mr. Hughes: We have directed the sports committees to review that. We know that is a concern. But we have directed sports committees to address that. If you met some type of minimum, then the highest seed would then get the bid. We have looked at that.

Richard Beechner (University of Nebraska at Kearney): I have several comments.

In regard to regionalization, I think that we need a spirit of cooperation in all sports in the region if we are going to be able to evaluate our records. I think that as coaches and athletics directors we need to make sure that the almighty win is not necessarily the best criteria in basketball. The makeup of the committee also is very important. I have found in my personal experience that athletics directors and conference commissioners can make a more objective decision in terms of who should be in the playoffs. This is very important if we are going to become regionalized.

It has been brought to my attention by our track coach that maybe it would be wise to consider one major championship. Maybe the Division II championships are not a true championship because we are not filling up the events the way it is now.

The last item I have is addressed to the athletics directors. It seems that we are the only group in Divisions I, II and III that are not organized as a group. I suggest that Division II directors have a meeting.

Mr. Hughes: Many of those concerns are being addressed, specifically the membership of the sports committees. We are trying to increase athletics administrators on those sports committees as opposed to coaches. The Executive Committee is looking at many of the

issues that you addressed.

Allen Archer (Lone Star Conference): I think we have to look at the insignia below the speaker's podium. It says NCAA. The concept that we are talking about is regionalization. Shouldn't that be RCAA with regionalization there?

We have to look at this in terms of competitiveness and fairness with the regional concept versus the national concept. You can't take one or the other. The best of both worlds can be gained with some innovative ideas and more review of the structure in all sports—be it basketball, football or track. Whatever the sport may be, the concept of regionalization should keep national perspective in mind. We are competing for a national championship, not a regional championship. If you want to get into the business of doing regional championships, that's fine. I think you then set up a situation by which Division I is considering the bowl concept versus a Division I playoff.

You have got some problems with respect to that, although I do see some enlightening efforts. I have been enlightened by some of my colleagues. I think that there are some problems with regionalization. I think the best of both worlds can be achieved.

Paul E. Hartman (Oakland University): Would you review again your comments about the "bubble sport" problems? For example, we are dangerously close to losing the men's swimming championships. We have some institutions coming into Division II that do not have swimming. Does that change the situation rather quickly? What are we looking at? Would you review that for me please?

Mr. Hughes: You must have 20 percent of the membership. To answer your question, yes, it does affect that. That is what has put some of these sports on the bubble. We have not had a decrease of sponsorship in Division II. We have had an increase of membership. It is going to take some creative thinking to protect these sports because currently the bylaws would make them go away.

Mr. Hartman: As I understand from what you have said, they shouldn't fall below the minimum, which is 20 percent.

Mr. Hughes: That's correct. That's the bylaw.

Mr. Hartman: There is a two-year grace period?

Mr. Hughes: That's correct.

Mr. Hartman: But that could change with legislation at any time. Is that correct?

Mr. Hughes: That's also correct. For example, in Division II wrestling, the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference obviously has a number of institutions that meet and compete in Division II wrestling. They sponsor wrestling, but at the Division I level. Those schools currently are not counted for Division II. They do sponsor Division II programs but they wrestle in Division I. I think some issues like that need to be looked at.

Mr. Hartman: I like your regionalization and your play-in concepts. I hope that includes all sports, not just basketball.

Mr. Hughes: We are open to all sports committee suggestions.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): How many schools currently sponsor football? Do we know that?

Mr. Hughes: One hundred twenty-nine.

Mr. Barkey: Do any of the new members sponsor football?

Mr. Hughes: About half, but I am not sure about that.

Mr. Barkey: It could be as many as half. Where do we have to get to expand the Division II football championship?

Mr. Hughes: Football currently is at 55 percent with a 16-team bracket. The next level for a 20-team bracket would be 65 percent or approximately 163 schools.

Mr. Barkey: When and if that happens, we have to finish by the second weekend in November now. We utilize four Saturdays to complete that 16-team playoff. If we expand, can we finish a Division II football playoff before Christmas vacation? Is it going to require one more weekend?

Mr. Hughes: The way it currently works, yes, it would require an additional weekend.

Mr. Barkey: It would not take us past the Christmas holiday?

Mr. Hughes: No, because Division I-AA is one week after us. We have one more week.

Kenneth A. Lindsey (Great Lakes Valley Conference): One of my concerns is the improvement in the maintenance of the officiating. I would like the championship committee to not do anything that would exclude Division II officials from the contest. It seems that in basketball in some instances we have specified Division I officials. I would like to see us open that up to Division II officials.

Mr. Hughes: Your comments are consistent with the position of the championships committee. Various sports committees have chosen to go other routes. The championships committee is consistent with your comments.

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I had some concern upon hearing your initial comments. In the sports of men's lacrosse, men's ice hockey and women's field hockey, the membership passed last year legislation to sort out the situation for Division III and to reestablish those championships for Division II.

My understanding at that time was that that was an exception recommended first by the Executive Committee and then adopted by the membership, which went away from the ratios that were required for those sports in that special circumstance.

Now this morning I hear you say even after that action that the championships committee may now take a look at this in June of 1993 and that if we haven't met that ratio, were in danger of losing the championships after the 1993-94 year. We knew in 1983 that Division II field hockey did not meet the ratios. That was why the championship was dropped in the first place. I am just a little surprised to see that kicked back.

You indicated National Collegiate Championships. We all know that translates virtually as Division I. In that circumstance, anyone who has a sport that has that "opportunity" has never seen the championship from inside the lines in, for instance, women's lacrosse. So I don't think that is really any opportunity at all. It is just a further diminishing of the opportunities in Division II. Our membership keeps growing, but it seems like it really is only growing in basketball and perhaps a couple of the others. But that seems

to be the focus of Division II.

Mr. Hughes: Your comments are correct. The Division II championships came about as a product of membership structure because those institutions that sponsored those sports were competing at the Division III level. At the point in time the membership structure was passed, it was a situation to give those institutions a place to go so that they would not be disengaged from a championship opportunity. It also was the understanding of the Executive Committee at that point in time that the structure was in. No Division II championships would be displaced until the structure went in next year. Then all championships would be looked at, as the bylaws require.

If you look at the Manual, your perception is correct. I believe the Executive Committee will prepare legislation to review that next year. Obviously it would be the prerogative of the membership to vote that up or down based upon the merits of that bylaw.

Ms. Taylor: I am just concerned. I think new membership in every division is a wonderful thing. I just think we must go back again. We have heard the Division II philosophy explained many times. My understanding of that is it is a broad-based philosophy. The programs coming in should be programs that are offering sport opportunities for both male and female athletes in a rather substantial number of sports. I am just afraid that we are losing our focus. We talk about legislation and concerns and we always tend to try to find a little tag for it.

The term in this situation that comes to my mind is bait and switch. I really have a concern about it. We have increased numbers in the Northeast and in the Mid-Atlantic states in those sports that we are talking about, but we will never increase them to the degree that the membership is going to be increasing based on basketball enhancement moneys, for example.

Lois Webb (Florida Southern College): I'm concerned about regional poll publication. As Mr. Battle has indicated, coaches should pay attention to the regional poll. This year we did have quite a challenge ahead of us on our volleyball committee in that we did conduct weekly evaluations from results that were given to us. At first, we were not allowed to divulge that evaluation. Two to three weeks into the year, we were told we could share this information regionally, which we did. However, that information was not to go to the media.

Recently at the volleyball convention in December, the membership in Division II was pretty much unanimous in the question of why can we not have the regional poll published to expose our sport to the media as well as amongst the membership. I think members need to know where they are evaluated so they know what is ahead of them when they are playing the next contest. We need a little enlightenment from the committee on what the position will be for this coming year.

Mr. Hughes: The current Executive Committee decision is if an outside agency publishes a poll for a sport, then that will be the poll. Currently that's the Tachikara poll. I think the Division II volleyball committee needs to discourage Tachikara from publishing that poll. Then you could distribute your poll.

Ms. Webb: Is it sport specific? Is there a poll for men's and women's basketball?

Mr. Hughes: Men's and women's basketball does not currently have an outside agency that does a Division II poll. The Division II men's committee and the Division II women's committee do the poll. I think the only sport in Division II that has an outside agency doing a national poll is men's soccer.

That was an Executive Committee action across all divisions. It is the same in Division I, Division II and Division III. If an outside agency does one, there will be no published poll by the sports committee.

Ms. Webb: The Tachikara poll is not accurate. It does not receive the information we receive weekly. There are many discrepancies and many questions and surprises when selection time comes. That's our major concern.

Mr. Hughes: I agree with that. I think the volleyball coaches and committee members should encourage Tachikara not to do the poll. That would be my position.

Deborah Chin (University of New Haven): Unfortunately, for women's athletics we have not been privileged to have a lot of sponsorship for many of our sports. So for you as a chair of the committee to suggest that we discourage the minimum amount of sponsorship I think defeats our purpose. Perhaps we may look at it a little bit differently.

Tachikara presently conducts what we term as a national poll, but we are moving into this concept of regionalization, which is a whole new area. Tachikara does not focus on a regional poll. Nor do we provide information to the people that make up that poll. They are not regional people. They are national people. So I see it as two different approaches to solving what we want. NCAA member institutions should be afforded the opportunity to know where their teams stand during the season. We do not evaluate our coaches and teachers without information. How can we then put teams on the floor and not give them the opportunity to even know where they stand in the region based on a national poll that isn't accurate? We don't have perhaps that intraregional play that we may have had before.

I would strongly encourage the championships committee to reconsider their decision on not permitting the Division II volleyball committee to host regional polls for next year.

Mr. Hughes: We found that poll to be very confusing. You might find a team in the top 10 in the Tachikara poll and not even be in the top four or five in their region. We felt as though the committee's poll was the more accurate poll, but the Association did not want to expend dollars on two polls for one sport.

James P. Jorgensen (Northern California Athletic Conference): I would like to encourage that when the committees are made up that they are consistent in how they operate and consistent in their formation. As a commissioner, when I hear different representatives from our conference talk about their participation on the committees, sometimes they don't focus on the same issues and we become inconsistent. If those items were published, it would assist the members of

the committee. Also, with respect to Division II, we have the opportunity to participate in the assignment of officials for football and in women's basketball. We do not have that opportunity in men's basketball. Those appointments are made by Division I supervisors. I think we need to take care of Division II with Division II.

Mr. Hughes: I agree with that. But as I indicated earlier, that is something that the Division II Championships Committee has passed on to the various sports committees. So members of sports committees, if you would adhere, we would appreciate it.

Robert M. DeGregorio Jr. (Merrimack College): I rise with several concerns. First, I would like to support and echo the sentiments of Sharon Taylor from Lock Haven. We currently are moving all of our men's lacrosse programs from Division III leagues into a Northeast-10 Division II league. And we are being told that in possibly a year our conference is going to be wiped out or our national championship could be wiped out. This is a grave concern because currently we have played in the past in Division III leagues with an opportunity to participate in a Division III national championship. Likewise, some of our schools have been playing Division I field hockey and are moving to Division II and dropping scholarships to meet requirements. If we make these moves to participate in these national tournaments and they are eliminated, you are reducing our opportunities as institutions to participate.

On the subject of automatic qualifiers, which we have had a great deal of experience with, particularly in appeals in the sport of women's softball, we feel that there is a great deal of inconsistency in the criteria in how these are developed. We agree with the championships committee that there should be standardization. We participated in the Division II national championship two years ago in women's softball. The following year, our conference lost its automatic qualifier. Two of the criteria that we did not meet was how well we competed as a conference against the top-20 ranked teams in the country. Only three of the schools in the top 20 were from our region. The rest of the schools were from the South, the West, and the Southwest, which would have brought a great burden to each of our institutions to travel to these areas to participate in competition.

Secondly, it was based on our past history. Past history should not come in. These new conferences and schools that are entering our division now have no history. How will they ever get an automatic qualifier? Past performance should not be a requirement. It should be based on what you are doing now. I've served on a regional advisory committee in the sport of women's softball. In the Division II handbook there is a statement—it is in most of the handbooks—that the selection committees are not bound by what the regional committees recommend. This is wrong. I will cite an example. The year that Sacred Heart and Merrimack College participated in the NCAA regional Division II softball tournament at Sacred Heart, there were two other schools in New England—the University of New Haven and the University of Bridgeport—that were of equal stature and should have played. Instead, two schools were brought in from other regions. New Haven had one or two losses greater than we did

When we played New Haven, we beat them 1-0 in 27 innings and 2-1 in 15 innings. That competition speaks for the equity and the opportunity that should have been afforded that institution and it wasn't.

I agree that these things have to be looked at, but I think that the rationale should be given that each region with regional committees should be able to determine and advise the selection committee and that the selection committee could not change what their recommendations are. The only reason other regions will get better is if they are given the equal opportunity to participate in championships both regionally and nationally. We have talked to you about extra money. If there is extra money that could be expended in Division II, I would recommend two things: One, give it to the championships and expand the opportunities for all members of Division II to participate. This next one may be a bit of a sacred cow, but I have been coming here for 10 years and going to the honors dinner, I would like to see some Division II athletes honored and praised nationally.

Mr. Hughes: I don't think any of us would disagree with that. Your concern about the automatic qualification is the exact concern that the championships committee has. The various sports committees are all over the map. I think your concern with the softball committee should be noted with members of the softball committee seated in the audience.

We have heard numerous horror stories that typify exactly what the previous speaker just expanded upon. That's why the championships committee has a real concern with how the various sports committees grant automatic qualification, which is all over the map, and how they determine to move teams all over the country. It sometimes borders on back-room politics and is self-serving. That's why we are trying to make the selection process more consistent.

If you have any further considerations, I would be happy to answer your questions independently, but I think if we would like to finish by noon, we do have to turn the chair back over to Vice-President Ceddia. Thank you for your interest. If you have any concerns, please address them to me or other members of the championship committee.

Mr. Ceddia: Jerry, we thank you and the panelists for a very nice presentation and a stimulating discussion. It is clear that we are going to have more comments and reactions about championships in Division II over the next few months and couple of years. I would ask the membership to be vigilant in their interests in this matter, stay informed and stay involved in it.

I would like now to announce that we would provide any member an opportunity for reconsideration of any of the proposals that were acted upon earlier.

RECONSIDERATION OF VOTING ACTION

Reconsideration of Local Sports Clubs

Robert M. DeGregorio Jr. (Merrimack College): I would like the Division II delegates to reconsider Proposal No. 115.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. DeGregorio: After this was voted, I was able to get an interpretation. One of my concerns and the reason why I think this

should be reviewed by Division II is, Merrimack College has adopted the local schools. Our coaches and student-athletes spend many hours putting on clinics, coaching and teaching these potential student-athletes.

These young kids come from impoverished areas that need our help and our outreach. I have been informed by the NCAA that we would no longer be able to do these activities with students that are of grade nine or greater. But unfortunately, these students are in that poverty area and are included.

Merrimack College also runs what is known as an ABA camp for young men and women in these clubs. These also would be affected.

I would ask that Division II reconsider this and turn this down. I don't think we have the same problems and the same violations that are created in Division I.

[The motion to reconsider was defeated.]

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Ceddia: Ladies and gentlemen, I now conclude my tenure as Division II vice-president at the conclusion of this meeting. I want to thank the Division II Steering Committee. I also want to thank the Division II membership for its sincere cooperation during my two-year tenure. I would suggest to you that as we consider the future of Division II, we not just be concerned about its personality, but we also focus on its character.

If you look at the mission statement on Division II, it describes I think very adequately what we are as a division. I would just caution our membership that at times we get caught up in what our personality looks like as opposed to what our values are or should be. As an outgoing Division II vice-president, I hope in the future we will be equally concerned and perhaps even more concerned about the values that characterize Division II intercollegiate athletics throughout the United States.

I thank you for the privilege and the honor to have served you during these past two years. I wish you well.

[The Division II business session was adjourned at noon.]

Division III Business Session

Thursday Morning, January 14, 1993

The Division III business session was called to order at 8 a.m., with Division III Vice-President John Harvey, Carnegie Mellon University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Harvey: Good morning and welcome to the Division III business session. Our task today is to complete the Presidential Agenda Day portion of the agenda for the Division III business session.

[Note: Various announcements and introductions were made and the electronic voting procedure was explained.]

Before we move on, I would like to make some brief comments. During the past year, our steering committee and the various committees I have met with have spent considerable time discussing a number of topics of importance to Division III. The forthcoming reports will provide more detail on their work. I want to emphasize several major thrusts underlying the discussions that I have heard among these committees throughout the year.

The first of these is relevancy. We have endeavored to help assure that Division III legislation and Division III activities are appropriately relevant and accurately reflect our division's philosophy. That has been a key theme in the past year or two. We want to continue that. This has been true in the area of championship study, legislative changes and elsewhere.

Secondly, as has the NCAA as a total organization, Division III has been very conscious of the need to advance the interests of gender equity wherever possible. In legislation, in championships issues, in the development of our institutional self-study guide, gender equity often entered into our discussions. We believe that Division III, considering the unique aspects of its philosophy, can and should reflect the principles and manifest the practice of gender equity.

Thirdly, your representatives on the steering committee have kept in mind the principles and the intent of the reform movement. We would be wrong to neglect that effort before the task is complete. In considering legislative proposals, therefore, cost containment has been a major objective as we took positions on these proposals. Other increases in playing and practice seasons have also been a concern to the steering committee. We join the Presidents Commission in these efforts of reform.

That is an appropriate lead-in to our steering committee report.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Steering Committee

Sandra R. Weeden (State University of New York at Stony Brook): The Division III Steering Committee was successful in sever-

al endeavors in 1992. In particular, it obtained a permanent waiver of the 25-second clock rule for Division III football in time for the 1992 season. Four major topics dominated our agenda during this past year—the institutional self-study guide, gender equity, graduation rates and championships.

One of our major initiatives included the revision of the institutional self-study guide. The steering committee believed that by revising the self-study guide, it would be a more effective and useful tool for our programs versus participating in the peer review certification program that Division I is voting on at this Convention. After two years of discussion, the steering committee supported the participation of Division III institutions in reporting graduation rates to the NCAA in lieu of reporting them to the Federal government, as required by the Student Right-To-Know Act. By joining ranks with our Divisions I and II counterparts, it will assist the NCAA's efforts in presenting a united front, with all divisions participating in the endeavor. Our requirement is an enrollment and persistence-rate disclosure form, which is far less complex than the graduation-rate disclosure form filed by Division I institutions.

We also were successful in having Division III institutions that are multidivisional classified and that award athletics aid to report information in those sports in a consistent manner with our other Division III sports.

The Division III Steering Committee urged the Gender-Equity Task Force to ascertain if a questionnaire currently exists that institutions could use to determine the interest level of women who may want to participate in an intercollegiate sport currently not being offered on their campus. If a questionnaire does not exist, the committee recommended that the Gender-Equity Task Force develop one that could be used by our member institutions.

The steering committee made several recommendations to the championships committee. Specifically, it recommended increasing opportunities for women in the championship structure and supporting the retention of the regionalization philosophy in Division III in the selection of teams for championship play.

A routine agenda item for each of our four steering committee meetings is to consider waiver requests of membership requirements. We would like to note that the Division III membership has increased by approximately 20 percent between 1983 and 1992. Further, the declining membership in the NAIA suggests to us that we will continue to see a significant rise in membership applications. In response to this trend, the steering committee supports a study by the Committee on Review and Planning on the long-range ramifications of increased membership in Division III. We are anxious to hear your views on this topic during one of our open sessions.

We do spend considerable time on legislation during the course of the year. This past year, we continued to apply cost-containment principles in support of the Presidents Commission's ideology as we reviewed and determined our position on individual pieces of legislation.

Presidents Commission

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): I am pleased this

morning to report on behalf of my colleagues on the Division III Presidents Commission our progress over the last 12 months.

The Presidents Commission is composed of 44 members, 11 of whom are drawn from Division III. If you would direct your attention to Page 237 of your Official Notice, you will find a listing of all 44 members and the Division III representatives.

I see several of my colleagues. I wonder if you might just give them a hand for the work they have done on your behalf. You may want to take that applause back later on, but I thought I ought to get it in early while we could.

It has been my privilege to serve as the chair of the Division III Presidents Commission for the last three years at a time when I think we have made very significant progress in behalf of the reform agenda. I have said before and would say again that I think Division III approximates more than any other division the ideal of the scholar-athlete. And among our 340 institutions, though there be wide diversity, I think we do try very hard to do those things that are ultimately and finally in the interests of the scholar-athlete. I think these actions come to pass because we pay close attention to how rules are written, how legislation is enacted and how that legislation will safeguard the interests of our students. Often, what this means is that we have strong presidential control at the conference level; that we have an increasing balance between men and women's sports; that we contain costs wherever we can and perhaps most importantly, that we recognize that Division III is about playing for the love of the sport, not for some professional contract or some great pot of gold at the end of a rainbow—though during these difficult financial times we could all use a cup of gold.

The legislation that will come to you this morning with recommendations from the Division III Presidents Commission has certain controlling assumptions bounding these proposals. Certainly, we are intent on maintaining the progress of the reform agenda as it bears on cost containment, limits on playing and practice seasons, strengthening admission requirements and progress toward graduation, and paying attention to the general welfare of our scholar-athletes.

On all four of those key considerations, Division III has provided the leadership for the NCAA. I am very proud to have carried the flag for you with my colleagues on the Presidents Commission on these matters. It also is true that we have debated, enacted, modified, rescinded and even maintained some legislation that was written several years ago and is still on the books. The veterans of these Conventions know how much time we have put into legislation.

At the Convention last year, after an extraordinarily lengthy, spirited and difficult debate on playing and practice seasons, I asked for a straw vote on this question: "How many present would support a moratorium on any new playing and practice season legislation for this Convention?"

The vast majority raised their hands, perhaps out of exhaustion, and said we support such a moratorium. Consequently, the Presidents Commission has used that notion of a moratorium. Thus, it has opposed any playing and practice legislation that has been sub-

mitted, irrespective of its merit. We took that vote seriously a year ago. It said give one year of time for legislation to settle. Let us see how these actions work.

Many of the playing and practice proposals only came into effect in August of 1992. It was our view based on your sentiment that we ought to oppose a moratorium principle on any new legislation. Now, as will become evident in the debate, that principle of moratorium on occasion placed the Council in opposition with other principles that it normally would endorse. Cost containment and gender equity happen to be two of those principles that are embedded in several playing- and practice-season proposals that certain members have brought forward. We will oppose that legislation because we have called for the moratorium and because a number of individuals, institutions or conferences approached the Presidents Commission and encouraged and advised it to hold playing and practice legislation until 1994. We could not dictate it. We did not intend to, but we tried to be consistent in saying will you honor the straw vote at last year's Convention? There will be several proposals brought forward today that deal with playing and practice seasons. The Commission will oppose it in its membership, but it certainly is the option of every delegate to vote his or her conscience.

You will hear Commission members speak to certain issues that in every other instance they would support it. But they felt duty-bound and that they had made a promise to other persons who withheld such legislation not in this instance to support it. I suspect if such legislation fails this year, several of those Commission members will be the first on their feet next year to support it on the merits inherent in the legislation.

If you are keeping score, there are several such playing- and practice-season proposals that have come before you. We will itemize those for your consideration so you will know why it is that we oppose them. Legislation regarding playing and practice season that the Commission will ask you to oppose includes the following: Nos. 38, 39, 41, 42, 43 and 46. On the single, simple, straightforward issue of moratorium, we would ask you to oppose those.

On other issues, we are asking you to oppose them for one or more reasons—cost containment, extension of playing and practice season or because these are not viewed as necessarily in the general interests of the scholar-athlete. All of you have a table that lists those actions the Presidents Commission asks you to take. On Page 175 of the Official Notice, you will see those items listed by asterisks, which are coming to you from the Presidents Commission. The items that have been asterisked are items that we ask you to oppose. We hope we can move through these items this morning with frank, full and forceful debate.

I believe that the Commission has sought to represent your views with integrity. It has worked long and hard and has met numerous times. We believe that what we bring to you is in the best interests of Division III and of the NCAA.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to serve you and to be one who could carry the flag of Division III in these important and difficult times.

Championships Committee

Mary R. Barrett (University of Massachusetts, Boston): The Division III Championships Committee meets three times a year and is responsible for the review of recommendations submitted by sports and rules committees as they relate to the administration of the Division III championships program. Committee actions are published in *The NCAA News* after each meeting. I therefore won't take the time during this session to summarize all of the actions that the committee took.

During the 1991-92 academic year, a total of 7,219 student-athletes competed in 24 Division III championships compared to 7,195 during the previous year. The percentage of Division III institutions that participated in championships was 68.2 percent, an increase of nearly two percent. Nearly \$3.8 million was spent for transportation and per diem expense. It should be noted that the amount allocated for Division III championships has almost doubled since the 1989-90 academic year.

The conduct and review of a comprehensive study of the NCAA championships program took the majority of the committee's time during this year. The initial impetus for the study was the status of selected National Collegiate Championships that were in jeopardy of being discontinued due to declining sponsorship numbers. This prompted discussions about the general philosophy of championships programs and in particular the desires of the membership regarding the program relative to other Association programs and services.

At its May 1992 meeting, the Executive Committee and the Divisions I, II and III Championships Committees reviewed the requests from sports committees totaling about \$1.8 million. Action on the majority of these requests was deferred until the completion of the comprehensive review.

You may recall that to permit a more accurate budgeting and planning process, the Executive Committee has determined that all requests with a financial impact must be forwarded before the May meeting and acted upon at that meeting. This change in procedure has greatly assisted the championships' and sports committees' long-range planning.

Last summer, the committee conducted a survey of all Division III presidents, directors of athletics and senior women administrators to gather information to assist the committee in its review. The review included the following general areas: 1. Financial analysis. 2. Championship participation opportunities for men and women. 3. Minimum sponsorship requirements for the establishment or continuation of a championship. 4. Championship policies. 5. Committee sizes and composition. 6. Officiating fees and expenses.

The issues were complex. Although only 32 percent of the Division III membership responded to the survey, the information provided the committee with a springboard for its long-range planning.

The championships committee spent the majority of the August meeting reviewing the study and concluded that the following factors necessitated changes in the championship program: 1. Interest in assuring that participants in Division III championships have a quality

experience. 2. Interest in achieving gender equity throughout the program. 3. The need to address the subjective nature of the championship's decision-making process. 4. Maintaining the Division III philosophy in selection of participants and sites for the championships. 5. The need to treat financial concerns of both the Association and the institutions.

In addition, the committee developed some principles to guide its deliberations. During the December meeting, the committee refined its principles and developed the proposed changes that you read about in the December 16 issue of *The NCAA News*. The committee is extremely interested in your input and will be seeking your reaction to these changes during tomorrow's business session. We will distribute a copy of the principles that we have developed and discuss them in greater detail during that session. We are extremely interested in your ideas and will welcome any comments you may have on the proposal. After we have reviewed your reaction to the proposal, we plan to go forward with a final recommendation to the Executive Committee for consideration during the May meeting. If approved by the Executive Committee, the increase in brackets would be in place for the 1993-94 championships.

During the coming year, the committee will continue its long-range planning and examine more specific areas such as officials' fees and expenses, consistent application of the regionalization concept in the selection of teams, and committee sizes and composition.

As always, we welcome your suggestions to improve the championships program. We do read your correspondence and forward it to the appropriate people so that your concerns are heard and considered. Please don't hesitate to contact me, any member of the committee or Donna Noonan, who is an NCAA director of championships and serves as staff liaison to the committee. During tomorrow's meeting about championships, Donna will be in attendance, which does not usually happen. Championships directors don't usually attend the Convention, but we thought that it was extremely important for Division III to be heard about any of the concerns or issues about championships. I think Donna will prove to be an extremely valuable resource, especially in terms of some of the historical perspectives and some of the costs and the facts and figures that you need to have discussed.

We look forward to your attendance tomorrow and would certainly welcome any concerns or any information that you would like to share with the committee.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons

Layton Shoemaker (Messiah College): On behalf of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference, I move Proposal No. 38 [The motion was seconded.]

After the comments of President Warren, I feel a bit like Saddam Hussein with the planes hovering and the battleships aimed, but I will go forward.

In the words of President Sweet in yesterday's introductory address to the 1993 Convention: "Yesterday represents experience. To-

morrow represents hope. Today represents the opportunity to get from one to the other." She further stated that we need to pursue that in the spirit of fairness and equitable procedures. In his state of the NCAA report, Executive Director Dick Schultz emphasized that we need to demonstrate our willingness to be more concerned about the needs and interests of our student-athletes. It is in the spirit of these concerns that Proposal No. 38 is before you and being recommended by the members of the Middle Atlantic Conference.

We believe it is extremely important that our colleagues in Division III understand the history and genesis of the issues contained in Proposal No. 38. The principles being proposed in No. 38 originally were addressed at the 1991 Convention. There were a number of flaws in that original proposal, which had an effective date of August 1, 1992, with the understanding that the flaws could be corrected and reconsidered at the 1992 Convention before the agreed-upon implementation date.

It is very important to recall what happened at the 1992 Convention. The elements of No. 38 were presented in a format similar to the current proposal. The one glaring difference was the introduction of an 18-week playing season. That met with strong opposition at the Division III business session. At that point, it was voted to divide the proposal and vote on it in its segmented parts. The move to divide lost by three votes and the proposal was voted upon as an entire package. The proposal then failed; not because the membership disagreed with the principles of the proposal, but because it contained an 18-week playing proviso that met with strong objection.

Therefore, what is in place now is more by default than by design. It is the belief of the members of the Middle Atlantic Conference that it is much more important to operate with legislation by design rather than that which may be in place by default. Proposal No. 38 is designed to correct the flaws of legislation in place by default and more accurately reflects the principles of fairness and equitable procedures so eloquently suggested by President Sweet. Proposal No. 38 is consistent with the reform measures being promoted by the Presidents Commission. In some instances, it extends those reform measures even further than they presently are being proposed.

Consider for a moment the incongruous nature of the legislation currently in place by default. Current legislation permits both pre-season practice and the first contest to take place on the same day for fall sports. Surely, that is not what was intended, nor is it what we would try to practically implement. Proposal 38 provides us an opportunity to correct that anomaly. When Proposal No. 38 failed at last year's Convention due primarily to the 18-week provision, it was recommended that it be brought back to this Convention to include the original 21-week provision. Therefore, it is in that spirit that the elements of No. 38 are before you for reconsideration.

With utmost respect for the Presidents Commission, which opposes this legislation, we sincerely urge you to reconsider the history and genesis of Proposal No. 38. We understand and respect the presidents' desire to place a moratorium on tinkering with legislation just recently adopted. We respect the presidents' position and your

authority to ultimately govern the legislative process in intercollegiate athletics. It is our position that Proposal No. 38 supports the tenets of the reform movement and offers the members of Division III an opportunity to conduct their athletics affairs by the provisions of legislation that is in place by design rather than by default.

It is essential not to fall victim to throwing the baby out with the bath water as a response to other legislation that is perceived to run counter to the presidents' reform movement. We believe we are offering an opportunity to more appropriately meet the needs and interests of our student-athletes via fair and equitable procedures. We believe this is each president's desire on his or her respective campus.

In consultation with a number of our colleagues in Division III, we acknowledge the somewhat divergent issues at stake in Proposal No. 38. For that reason, we believe it may be prudent to consider the various segments of No. 38 separately. Therefore we would like to request that this body act first on dividing No. 38 and act on items A and B combined then C through E separately. We urge our colleagues to carefully and objectively analyze what is in the best interests of their student-athletes. I move for division of Proposal No. 38.

[The motion was seconded and failed.]

William E. Lide (Salisbury State University): On behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 38.

The Division III membership defeated a similar version of this proposal at last year's Convention. That vote was based on many factors. We do not need to revisit all of those factors in detail. Basically the membership decided that the playing and practice legislation enacted last August better addressed issues related to cost containment, aside from playing season and the time commitments of Division III student-athletes, than the legislative provisions of this proposal. The Division III Steering Committee and the Commission believed that the wholesale legislative changes contained in Proposal 38 are at best premature since the applicable playing- and practice-season legislation has been in effect only about six months.

Robert J. Bruce (Widener University): I am a member of the Presidents Commission. In setting a framework to my comments in support of the opposition and in support of the Presidents Commission, let me say that five of the agenda items before us were sponsored or cosponsored by the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference, of which Widener is a member. When the legislation first was formulated, it was not fully understood by the conference presidents that it was the intent of the Division III Presidents Commission to support no changes to the reform legislation this year, particularly in the playing and practice legislation. Once the Presidents Commission made its position known, the presidents of the conference were in support of a moratorium against any changes. Now, are some of the legislative proposals good ones? Yes. Are they valid? Absolutely. Would I support them in the future? Yes.

But as President Warren said this morning, we want to wait at least one year for some of this legislative reform to prevent change to the change to the change taking place before we see how it works.

Division III, which is looked upon as the model that intercollegiate athletics should be operated, should not be leading the charge to make changes. So I speak quite strongly in opposing Proposal No. 38 and all the other legislation.

Michael F. Adams (Centre College): What you are hearing is a bit of selective retention about what happened at last year's Convention.

The vote that passed by only three votes was a procedural vote. But it was a vote where most of you knew exactly what was happening. Just as you knew a moment ago what was happening. I certainly associate myself with what has been said by Bob and by my friend, Bill. It also is a question of how we conduct business as a group. We entered this whole process last year. We spent almost 2½ hours on this matter last year. We are back now within 12 months. We risk this morning wasting another 2½ hours on the very same issues that we took up less than 12 months ago.

It is not that these proposals are without merit. No one is suggesting that. But they have not been reviewed by the appropriate committees. They have not been looked at insofar as impact on athletes themselves, on cost containment, on the overall playing-season proposals. Those of us on the Presidents Commission respectfully ask you to allow a moratorium, as we agreed to last year.

And, Mr. Chairman, in that question, and having already heard the response of the delegates to the motion to divide, I would respectfully call for the question.

[Proposal No. 38 (Page A-55) was defeated by Division III, 22-215, two abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Division III Preseason Practice Opportunities—Traditional Segment

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I appreciated President Warren's comments about spirited debate. Some of us come to the Convention with the understanding that there would be opportunities for debate and to try to persuade one another about particular proposals. In the past when we have taken straw votes, they have been just that. If there was a vote last year for a moratorium, then we probably should have been notified in advance that there would be a moratorium this year. I hope that we can get back and have that kind of spirited debate.

I rise to move Proposal No. 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation permits institutions a maximum of 21 practice opportunities before their first contest. Rather than picking an arbitrary date that may conflict with the start of the academic term or vacation periods, the 21 practices would bring equity and uniformity to Division III. It would allow each team the same amount of practice time in preparing for its first contest. In some cases, that does not now exist. Divisions I and II use this number effectively. I see no reason why it cannot work in Division III.

David G. Carter (Eastern Connecticut State University): I am a member of the Presidents Commission. I urge your opposition to Proposal No. 39.

President Warren was very clear in that many of us would like to

support many of these proposals. But the issue goes beyond how we feel. We also have an obligation to be sound and deliberate; to give items that we voted on an opportunity to be in effect so that we can observe and then function in a rational and reasonable manner.

[Proposal No. 39 (Page A-58) was defeated by Division III, 43-201, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

On-Court Basketball Practice—Divisions II and III

Mary Beth Kennedy (Nebraska Wesleyan University): I move Proposal No. 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

Linda S. Moulton (Clark University (Massachusetts)): On behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission, I urge you to defeat this proposal.

Returning the start of the on-court preseason basketball practice to October 15 will expand the length of the basketball playing and practice seasons, place additional strain on facilities, and will increase the athletics time commitment of student-athletes, coaches and support staff. This legislation represents an attempt to erode the accomplishments of the Association's past reform agenda and is a step backward for Division III. More practice time does not address the best long-term interests of our student-athlete.

I urge you to vote against this proposal.

James E. Nelson (Suffolk University): As a basketball coach, an athletics director and a member of the National Association of Basketball Coaches, I wish to give a qualified recommendation for Proposal No. 40.

Basketball coaches of Divisions I, II and III overwhelmingly would like a return to the October 15 starting date. But I recognize that a basketball coach's perceived power is much greater than the actual reality. Many times egos, particularly in Division I basketball, of head coaches get in the way of a true vision of what occurs at our Convention.

I speak in favor of Proposal 40 because we will have playing- and practice-season proposals coming before us again. Until November 1, practice sessions last two hours Monday through Friday with no weekend practices so that student-athletes can inculcate themselves with many of the social and academic activities of the university. We know that when basketball players return to campus, they probably will be in the gymnasium practicing beyond the two-hour limit. We discovered that 17 days was not sufficient time, particularly in Division III, to give the proper training. Athletes in Division III are not as skilled as Division I or Division II athletes.

We offer an open practice. Any member of the university can try out for the team. We need to give them a fair opportunity to demonstrate their skills. Time is lost for teaching and training fundamental skills that we need to devote to those individuals.

I will vote no on this proposal. My comments are based on the future to lay the groundwork.

[Proposal No. 40 (Page A-59) was defeated by Division III, 49-214, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons—Nontraditional Segment

Leslie J. Poolman (Dickinson College): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to limit the nontraditional segment of a Division III sport to 26 practice opportunities and to prohibit countable athletically related activities for at least one day per week during that nontraditional segment.

Some of you may be surprised to note that under current legislation it is possible for a fall sport to have a nontraditional segment of 10 weeks or 70 consecutive practice opportunities. While recognizing that this scenario would be particularly unusual, this proposal not only would eliminate the loophole that permits a nontraditional segment to be almost as long as the traditional segment, it also would provide some consistency with the traditional segment by requiring at least one day off per week during the nontraditional segment.

Rev. Michael J. Lavelle (John Carroll University): Despite the intent and the content of Proposal No. 41, I repeat what has been stated about the moratorium's value.

As a member of the Presidents Commission, I urge you to vote no on this issue.

[Proposal No. 41 (Page A-60) was defeated by Division III, 64-197, five abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Division III Women's Golf

Sandra R. Weeden (State University of New York at Stony Brook): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will specify that a Division III women's golf program shall have the same playing- and practice-season limits as Division III men's golf.

Currently, the only available championship opportunity for Division III women's golf programs is the National Collegiate Championship. Therefore, the Division I playing-season limits apply to Division III women's golf. Because the Division III limits will be more restrictive than the Division I limits that they will replace, the steering committee believes that this proposal actually will enhance the reform movement in Division III. The steering committee also believes the proposal enhances gender equity since it establishes uniform playing seasons for both sports.

This is the only proposal that the Council differs from the Presidents Commission. I trust that the Presidents Commission members will not shoot the messenger.

Andrea Wickerham (Luther College): There are 32 Division III institutions that sponsor women's golf. Twenty-three of these 32 institutions are located in Michigan, Minnesota and Iowa. We hold our respective conference championships in the fall. In these cold-weather states, the season is restricted to about mid-October. If we are lucky, that is the latest date for competition.

Proposal No. 42 would add six additional days to the women's non-traditional golf season in the fall and allow these institutions in cold-

weather climates to give their women's golf participants the same opportunity as Division III men's golf participants as it relates to length of playing season, preseason practice opportunities, first dates of competition and the number of dates of competition. If you read this proposal closely, you will see it actually reduces the length of the playing season by three weeks and reduces by four the total number of dates of competition for women. However, history indicates that those institutions in cold-weather climates are unable to fully use the playing and practice season as it now exists. The importance of Proposal No. 42 relates to the nontraditional start date and the first date of competition.

The National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators also supports this proposal. We ask you to do the same.

David L. Warren (Ohio Wesleyan University): I respectfully oppose No. 42. I do so on one ground only. That is the issue of moratorium.

I entirely agree with the substance of this proposal, as do members of the Presidents Commission. In every other instance I would support this proposal. If it fails at this Convention, I would move its adoption at the 1994 Convention. The sole reason that I ask you to oppose it is because the Presidents Commission has asked other individuals who have come forward with playing- and practice-season legislation to either withdraw that legislation or defer it until 1994.

This is an example of where principles are in conflict. But we have the organizing principle of the moratorium. We have very good first principles here of gender equity, cost containment and reducing playing and practice seasons. For all of those reasons, I would have supported it. But for the purpose of promise-keeping about the moratorium, I would ask you to oppose it. In this instance, I would ask that you not shoot the message deliverer.

John M. Schael (Washington University (Missouri)): I think Division III has served as a role model for athletics in America. I was always taught that you do the right thing at the right time for the right reason. This is the right reason. We should support Proposal No. 42.

Louis A. Barone (Baldwin-Wallace College): I have no vested interest in this. I represent an institution that does not sponsor women's golf. But I cannot resist at least one shot. I will say it with due respect.

The Presidents Commission, in persisting with the moratorium regardless of the merits of an issue, made an ill-advised decision. A moratorium on an ill-advised decision has no merits whatsoever, particularly with the inference that next year and we are probably going to change it. Some of these need to be looked at individually. Presidents are strange and wondrous creatures. But I was put on earth to disagree with them. I am playing my role.

Alice Chandler (State University College at New Paltz): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I would like to add to President Warren's report. No issue engaged greater debate than this one. All the arguments you have heard in regard to conflict of principles or overriding issues or individual conscience had more explicit discussion.

The vote was not unanimous within the Presidents Commission.

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): My impression is that we don't really have a decision on this issue. This is Federally mandated, is it not?

Mr. Harvey: Not as far as I know.

Mr. Carzo: Does not this prohibit us from balancing our programs? The way the legislation is now, are we not forced to change it to balance programs and equity and opportunity?

Mr. Harvey: I could not really interpret that. I have had no information that we need to carry this through.

[Proposal No. 42 (Page A-60) was adopted by Division III, 228-19, 16 abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons— Dividing Segments

Gene Norris (Trinity University (Texas)): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

What we are doing kind of reminds me of a bunch of faculty members and coaches sitting around the faculty lounge during spring break and saying how great it is, how quiet it is and wouldn't it be nice if it was like this all year long. We kind of forget what our jobs are for.

I always have been under the impression that I have been sent to these meetings to represent the student-athletes at the university. I represent, not the Presidents Commission or the presidents' feelings. When I vote, I vote what I feel is best for the student-athletes that I represent. I hope everyone does the same thing. If you vote against our proposal, vote against it on its merit, not on a philosophical thing of the Presidents Commission.

At last year's meeting, we passed a proposal that said that the nontraditional season must end in baseball by October 30. Well, this makes a lot of sense if you are in Division I or Division II. I guess there are some Division III programs that have full-time baseball coaches who spend the whole year working on their baseball programs. If you had the last part of August, all of September and all of October, you have got anywhere from maybe eight to 12 weeks to work on baseball. Many of us don't have that. We hire our coaches and they work in a fall sport and a spring sport. In our case, both of our baseball coaches are football coaches. Our football season runs into November. So the legislation that we put into effect last year does away with any nontraditional season. Our only option was to hire a part-time coach for our nontraditional baseball season. That certainly is not cost-containing. It cost us more money. The proposal that we are putting forth does not change the proposal that is in effect. All we are asking for is another option for those of us who are in that situation.

Let us start our off-season program October 15, which really won't happen because ours won't even start until November 15. Our off-season is going to be about a two-week program—from November 15 to December 1—but at least it gives us the option to have a nontraditional season. We have got 30 athletes who are paying \$16,000 to

come to our institution. Their choice is to participate in a nontraditional season. They should have the opportunity that every other Division III athlete around the country has to participate for the same amount of time. Based on this, I would urge your support.

Jon C. Strauss (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): I recognize this moratorium argument is having less weight as our discussion proceeds.

I nevertheless urge your vote in opposition to this proposal on the basis of the assurances we have made regarding the moratorium.

James Dimick (St. Olaf College): I am a baseball coach. I would like to speak in favor of this for the benefit of my colleagues in the South.

Baseball coaches in the North are not going to run a nontraditional season after October 31. You are not going to have baseball coaches who are not coaching football or another fall sport doing the same thing. You are talking about a very small handful of schools that are faced with this problem. I have been a baseball coach for 25 years in a Division III institution. I also have been a defensive line coach. I can empathize with the people at Trinity University. I know the baseball coach there. They are not trying to get an advantage. They are trying to get a part of the opportunity that coaches who they compete against have. This is different than other proposals because we are talking about a small number of schools that are affected.

[Proposal No. 43 (Page A-63) was defeated by Division III, 104-156, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Contest Exemptions—Division III Basketball

Robert C. Deming (Ithaca College): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal tries to equate the baseball programs with the annual exemptions that already exist in volleyball, football and basketball. I urge your support.

Dolores A. Bogard (State University College at Cortland): On behalf of the steering committee and the Presidents Commission, I urge your defeat of this proposal.

Exempting the season-ending baseball tournament in addition to the NCAA championship lengthens an already long baseball-playing season for a greater number of student-athletes. It increases cost for participating institutions. The proposal is inconsistent with the recent reform agenda in Division III. We urge your defeat of this proposal.

Alice Chandler (State University College at New Paltz): I was named the designated hitter for the Presidents Commission on this one. The previous speaker has spoken so well to the issues involved in this proposal that I would simply join her in urging your defeat of Proposal No. 44.

[Proposal No. 44 (Page A-64) was defeated by Division III, 46-206, six abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Contest Exemptions—Division III Basketball

Robert Doering (California Lutheran University): On behalf of the Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and a

number of other sponsors, I move Proposal No. 45.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 45 almost has all positive factors. It attempts to restore the foreign competition exhibition game that was removed about two years ago. This would be one more contest in addition to the 26 games that we have. It would be played at home. It is generally played before your normal season begins. The only cost that would really be involved would be game management, including officials, which is probably covered by your admission charges. It provides the positive experience of promoting international goodwill. It acquaints your students with a foreign basketball program and provides cultural experiences through the exchange of ideas with foreign students.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): Couldn't one of our scrimmages count for this foreign exhibition? We are allowed two scrimmages in basketball. Could we use one for one of these games?

Mr. Harvey: I believe that is correct, but that is my guess.

Daniel Wooldridge (Old Dominion Athletic Conference): I think it could. But you are not allowed to keep score or advertise or allow students to come to a scrimmage game.

If you had an international team come over, I don't think it would want to play under those conditions. So you really could not play an international game under the scrimmage rule. It would have to count as one of your regular games unless you did not keep score.

Jon C. Strauss (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): I speak on behalf of the Presidents Commission in urging your vote in opposition to this proposal.

The proposal obviously would increase time demands on student-athletes by exempting this additional contest. It is not consistent with the reform movement that we have been working so hard to enact these last several years. I therefore urge your vote in opposition.

[Proposal No. 45 (Page A-64) was adopted by Division III, 137-121, two abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Division III Playing and Practice Seasons

Geoffrey M. Miller (Washington College (Maryland)): On behalf of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference, I move Proposal No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 46 is intended to set a consistent starting date for competition in the fall traditional segments for cross-country, field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball. The proposed date is the first Saturday in September.

The intent of the proposal is to establish separate starting dates for when fall teams can begin practice and when they can begin competition. Presently, teams can begin practice and competition on the same date—August 24. For obvious safety and physiological reasons, we feel it is prudent to delay the start of competition for a least one week to allow the physical training and skill development to take place.

Rev. Michael J. Lavelle (John Carroll University): I think we al-

ways vote on the merit of any issue. One of the merits that we have talked about is the consideration of the moratorium. In that light, I would urge, as a member of the Presidents Commission, that we vote no on No. 46.

[Proposal No. 46 (Page A-65) was defeated by Division III, 44-214, four abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Maximum Dates of Competition—Division III Cross Country

Sherry Calvert (Whittier College): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the 1991 Convention, we addressed playing and practice seasons. It was the recommendation of the special committee assigned to study change that the fairest proposal was a 10-percent cut for all sports in competitive dates or numbers of contests. Unfortunately, sports that had reasonable competitive dates were cut along with those sports in which competitive opportunities may have been excessive.

This proposal requests the restoration of one competitive opportunity for cross country. If adopted and given nine opportunities, cross-country athletes still will have the fewest competitive opportunities of any sport. It is difficult if not impossible to explain to our cross-country athletes why they should have the fewest competitive opportunities given in our athletics programs. As a comparison to the eight competitive dates given cross country, consider the dates given to other sports. Football, 10. Gymnastics and riflery, 13. Wrestling, swimming and skiing, 16. Why eight for cross country?

Cross-country competition requires little of the student-athletes' time. Both men's and women's competition can be completed within 1½ hours and uses primarily, if not entirely in most cases, unpaid officials. I can think of no reason to discriminate against these athletes. There is no rationale that could be provided a cross-country athlete questioning these disparities.

I ask for approval of this proposal to bring cross country in line with the principles of Division III. Let us provide cross-country athletes with competitive opportunities similar to those opportunities we provide athletes in other sports. Nine competitive opportunities is not excessive for our cross-country athletes.

Robert J. Bruce (Widener University): I would like to first thank our colleague from Baldwin-Wallace for his definition of presidents. I have often been called strange, but never wondrous. So I thank you.

As a member of the Commission, I would like to ask your support in opposing No. 47 because I think this is probably the clearest-cut example of returning to where we were a year ago by adding contests. The decision in the reform legislation was to try to control practice time and contain costs.

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: I rise in support of the proposal. I think this is a correctable error. We can correct it today. It will put cross country in line with the other Division III sports.

[Proposal No. 47 (Page A-66) was approved by Division III, 157-102, four abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Maximum Number of Contests—Division III Football

Robert Bierie (Loras College): I move Proposal No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 48 is not contrary to the reform movement. It does not expand the playing season. It does not increase time demands on student-athletes. It does not add expenses. What it does is give certain student-athletes an opportunity to participate in freshman or junior varsity contests. Especially in our conference, there are a number of schools that choose to have a junior varsity schedule or a freshman schedule.

During a varsity contest, if you have a back-up quarterback who holds for field goals, that individual participates for one play. It constitutes one of the 10 contests charged against them in participation. This gives every student-athlete who is not a starter or does not play extensively in the football program an opportunity to play in a freshman or a JV contest, whether it is on Sunday or Monday.

The proposal as it is stated is consistent with the Division III philosophy to maximize opportunities for student-athletes.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I urge defeat of this proposal.

This proposal is inconsistent with the Division III reform agenda. It would increase the number of football contests that a student-athlete could participate in. The Division III philosophy of participation cannot be without realistic limits. It is important that these limits be maintained. The proposal leaves many questions unanswered. For example, it is not clear how the injury-hardship rule would apply to a student-athlete who has participated in junior varsity and freshman contests. Should that student-athlete be injured, would he be subject to 10 contests or 13 contests? For these reasons, I ask that this proposal be defeated.

Michael F. Adams (Centre College). I have been asked to speak on this issue by the Presidents Commission.

I would associate myself with the remarks previously made by my colleague and make two other points that I think are germane to this issue. One, you would have a hard time convincing most athletics directors that there is not additional cost and risk associated with this kind of expansion. I think there is an even bigger issue here. I think in the long run, that this is a gender-equity issue. That train is coming down the track. It is either coming from control within the NCAA or it is coming from the Federal government. In my opinion, this is the worst time in history that we could be expanding playing opportunities at the junior varsity level for males at a time when we are going to be asked to make cutbacks and to put things in balance to make gender equity a reality.

One of the things that will be at risk once we begin to address that issue beginning next year, is junior varsity programs. I don't say that with any glee. But I do believe that this would be the worst time that a college could start expanding opportunities for male students without regard to what is going to happen in the gender-equity issue.

For that reason, for cost containment and for the other reasons that have already been stated, the Presidents Commission would respectfully ask that you vote no.

[Proposal No. 48 (Page A-67) was defeated by Division III, 40-125, roll-call vote.]

Preseason Football Scrimmage—Division III

Charles W. Winters (Gettysburg College): On behalf of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference, I move Proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

For all of the logical and philosophical reasons we allow most of the other sports we sponsor to have at least one scrimmage, we urge you to again make this one preseason scrimmage available to football. This legislation will not lengthen the season. It merely will allow a preseason scrimmage with a neighboring institution. The legislation passed a year ago virtually eliminated the one preseason scrimmage because most coaches chose to give up the scrimmage date and play 10 games. We feel coaches and student-athletes in football deserve the same opportunities we extend to virtually every other sport we sponsor.

We urge you to adopt Proposal No. 49.

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): I rise to oppose this proposal on behalf of the steering committee and the Presidents Commission.

The addition of any contests, formal or informal, is inconsistent with the recent Division III reform agenda and should be reviewed very carefully. The addition of the preseason football scrimmage described in this proposal could increase institutional cost and student-athlete time commitments to athletics. The proposal contains no provision to limit the scrimmage to local opponents and a weekend date, even though the rationale statement discusses these concepts.

With all due respect to our many friends in the Ohio Conference and the Middle Atlantic Conference that are sponsoring this proposal, I urge you to defeat this proposal.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): I am speaking on behalf of the New Jersey Athletic Conference. I urge support of this proposal in that it offers football coaches the opportunity to prepare their team for the season.

Rev. Michael J. Lavelle (John Carroll University): The Ohio Athletic Conference, of which my school is a member, is in favor of this and also is a sponsor of this issue.

I personally am in favor of No. 49. I perhaps will argue in favor of it next year. However, following the Presidents Commission's wise deliberations this year and recommendations concerning the value and the merit of holding off on changes in legislation until next year, I urge this group to vote against No. 49.

Timothy W. Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): The Ohio Athletic Conference respects the reform movement. Our playing and practice seasons always have been far more restrictive than NCAA limits with very few exceptions. So we were delighted to be supportive of the reform movement. We would hope, however, that the membership would look at sports on an individual basis. Just as Dick Schultz alluded to a year ago and again last night, if adjustments are made, let's not consider that a back-sliding, but fine-tuning.

Football is a sport that has fewer contests, with the exception of cross country, than any other sport. It also is played on a nonschool day and rarely, if ever, is class time missed. It is somewhat puzzling that in Division I, where the problems that caused the reform movement are harbored, more games are allowed than in Division III, where many people think we reacted to problems that were not ours in the first place.

In a contact sport such as football, it makes sense to allow a scrimmage to prepare for the rigors of the season. It also gives officials a chance to get ready for the season. Graduation rates would be totally unaffected. There would be no missed class time. Budgets would virtually be unchanged. The logic is undeniable. We have a chance to send a message that reform for mere sake of reform is just not good enough and that moratorium for mere sake of moratorium is just not good enough. We have a chance to do what is right for our student-athletes and not react cosmetically to problems that were never ours in the first place.

James J. Whalen (Ithaca College): I rise to support Proposal No. 49. I have been president of Ithaca College for 18 years. For a few years because of scheduling difficulties, we had nine games. Therefore, we had a scrimmage. I was surprised when the legislation took effect that we could not have a scrimmage and 10 games. Every year we scrimmage Cornell University on a Saturday afternoon. If we were not scrimmaging them, we would be scrimmaging ourselves. I think it is a very healthy thing. The expense is minimal—and \$50 for a couple of officials. If presidents can take responsibility for seeing that these kinds of scrimmages are controlled and that there are no long-distance road trips, I see no reason why we should not allow something that has gone on for so many years—10 games and a scrimmage—not to be continued. So I support it for very good reasons.

John M. Schael (Washington University (Missouri)): I oppose Proposal No. 49.

I think President Whalen was a part of the reform movement when football originally had nine games and one scrimmage. In order to give football-playing institutions a choice, we said that they can have 10 contests. If they elect to keep a scrimmage, they can do that. If they wanted to play 10 regular-season games, they still have that option.

In the Midwest, it costs a little more to have a scrimmage. It costs more than \$50. It costs more than lunch, but I may be out of touch. I just think that football has many opportunities that certainly are not available to other athletes, particularly in the fall sports. They can come back with their 27 practice opportunities, et cetera. I think that football is in good shape.

I hope that we vote Proposal No. 49 down.

[Proposal No. 49 (Page A-67) was defeated by Division III, 62-106, roll-call vote.]

[The meeting was recessed for 15 minutes.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Harvey: The floor is now open for discussion on legislation that will appear in the general session.

Proposed Legislation—Committee Review and Amendment Limitation

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): Can someone from the Presidents Commission enlighten me on Proposal No. 51? What are they trying to do now?

Robert J. Bruce (Widener University): I don't know all the nuances. If it is passed, the main thrust deals with having a two-year moratorium while legislation could be worked through the appropriate committees before it would come up for a vote.

The Presidents Commission feels that it is significant to have a period of time where appropriate committees of the NCAA can wrestle with some of the issues that come up rather than having them on an annual basis.

Mr. Bogan: Are you saying that before I submit anything to an agenda, it has to be approved by this committee?

Mr. Harvey: No, not this committee, but referral to an appropriate committee. I believe that is what is specified. It is not a matter of approval. It would be referred to the committee for their opinions. It does not have to be approved, but it is not a censorship committee by any means.

Mr. Bogan: It is censorship. If 15 institutions decide to have some legislation on the floor and there is a committee that won't allow that legislation to reach the floor, then we stymie our debate.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): I came in after the question was asked, but I am starting to get the sense of what the conversation is about. I would like to clarify, based on what I have heard. You might want to go back to what the original question was. The only role that the committee will serve is to review the legislation, with the goal being to have better legislation.

The committee cannot say this legislation cannot go forward. Any legislation that is submitted, regardless of what the committee feels about it, can go forward if the proposers of the legislation wish for it to go forward. What is intended is that by going through a committee for review, that committee can make some suggestions or the committee may say it is terrific legislation, we are going to endorse it, we want to support you on that legislation.

But if the committee feels that there are some potential flaws, it is an opportunity for the committee to give some feedback to the proposers so that those flaws can be corrected before the legislation goes forward.

Mr. Bogan: Is there a timetable on that? Are they saying that they have two years to make that decision?

Ms. Sweet: No. The interpretation indicates that after the proposal has been submitted—by no later than October 8—there must be feedback to the proposers.

Joseph O'Rourke (Wabash College): My only complaint about this legislation is that it does have a quality of dead time about it. As we heard this morning, moratorium was used as the persuasive argument to moot several questions. This time, we are saying that this will become a standard procedure. I wonder why we have yearly Conventions if that is the case.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): On Page 72 of the Official Notice, there is information about sponsoring emergency legislative amendments during the two-year amendment limitation. If legislation gets out of the Convention through the right process and has an effective date that might be two or three years down the road, when does that two-year limitation start or stop? How do you repair legislation in that kind of a scenario?

Ms. Sweet: The two-year period starts from the effective date of the legislation. How you repair it is through the Council or the Presidents Commission. This was put in there with the recognition that there may be some legislation that goes forward that needs to be fine-tuned or adjusted before the two-year time period lapsed.

Did I answer your question?

Mr. Marshall: Let me ask you it again.

If something is going to be effective three years from now, then you can only effect change in that for the first two years. But if something comes up that you want to change between year two and three, that would not be possible?

Ms. Sweet: I am not sure I understand your question, Bill.

My understanding is that the two-year time period in which you cannot make any changes starts with the effective date of that particular piece of legislation. Any other time period is subject to the Council or the Presidents Commission putting forward emergency legislation.

Mr. Marshall: Okay. That is better. I appreciate that.

NCAA Staff Interpretations

Timothy W. Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): As a conference commissioner, I have some serious concerns about No. 150 specifying that an interpretation of NCAA legislation issued by the legislative services staff is not binding.

Mr. Harvey: I think the bothersome phrase there is "is not binding." Is that correct?

I think that is what has perhaps bothered some people. I feel that this is less of a difficulty than is perhaps perceived. Art Eason spoke the other day about a matter of perception and how this is perceived. I wonder if Art might want to make a comment on this matter of how our administrators might perceive this legislation.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): Part of the problem with Proposal No. 150, is since the proposal says it is not binding, then why should institutions bother to call the NCAA staff in an effort to get interpretations? The perception is that that interpretation is not going to be binding, you can do whatever you want to do. Unfortunately, in Division III we have one person doing compliance. I know in the case of William Paterson College I wear two hats. I am the athletics director and I am the compliance officer. Few of the conferences at the Division III level have a compliance officer.

In Division I, there is an entire compliance staff that can deal with the interpretations or what the proposal is supposed to say and what it is not supposed to say. I therefore feel it is bad legislation. I will oppose it and vote against that legislation.

Mr. Harvey: It also was pointed out in several discussions that

this legislation is not intended to reduce the work of the NCAA staff, as might have been perceived. We feel that the NCAA staff work will continue just as it has been, in a very helpful way. I have always felt that there is a great deal of effort given by the NCAA staff to help with interpretations. I am sure that this was not intended to take NCAA staff off the hook when you call them about legislation. The rationale statement speaks to that.

The proposal merely wants to encourage institutions to take greater responsibility for understanding and applying NCAA rules. The role of the staff will still be to assist the membership, but not make 100-percent binding decisions. I don't feel that this is a difficult one to consider, although I know the phrase "not binding" perhaps seems to open some gates.

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): Do you know how Division II feels about this proposal?

Mr. Harvey: I don't recall any discussion. Dan tells me his impression is that Division II might be against it.

Mr. Carzo: I would like to vote in opposition to that for the same reasons and the points that Arthur made. The fact that Divisions II and III do not have compliance coordinators is going to achieve just the opposite effect that Division I wants. Division I wants consistent interpretation. In Division III, where we don't have compliance coordinators and a lot of us don't have conference commissioners, we are going to get a very sporadic interpretation.

So I would urge our constituency to oppose this and contact your colleagues in Division II to see if you can get them to oppose it also. I think this would hurt us.

Mr. Harvey: That is a good point. That point was made in several conversations I heard. The fact that we don't have full-time compliance coordinators does increase the load on Division III people. I cannot guarantee Division II's position. We are only citing rumors.

Ms. Sweet: There was a very extensive discussion at the Council meeting. The Division II and Division III Council representatives were very articulate in expressing the concerns mentioned in this discussion. Those concerns were heard by Division I. In fact, there was some interest in withdrawing this proposal and not having it come to the Convention floor. We were told that if that happened, somebody would move to keep it on the table so it would be before the body. The compromise that I believe the Division I, Division II and Division III Council members arrived at was to allow for it to go forward for a fair hearing to make sure that everybody really understands what the implications are.

Maybe it will benefit Division I in some ways, but they need to hear what the impact might be on Division II and Division III. The Division I Council members were very understanding of what was being said. I encourage you to do two things during that discussion. Number one, speak to those points that you are concerned about; and number two, listen well to what is being said. There are some misperceptions and misinformation as far as what the real impact will be. There is a fear that it will result in dramatic changes. Based on discussion that I have heard, that may not be the case.

Louis A. Barone (Baldwin-Wallace College): The concern of our conference and member institutions is with lack of compliance officers. People hear what they want to hear. What is the liability to an institution or conference that accepts a decision in good faith and then finds that it is not binding or may be clearly illegal? That is a point that has to be considered. That is what bothers us about "non-binding." You ask for an interpretation in good faith. A conference or an institution operates on that. I won't bore you with past history of our conference. We have had this happen before this legislation was proposed. That is the concern—the liability.

GENDER-EQUITY DISCUSSION

Mr. Harvey: Seeing no one at the microphone on that, the topic of gender equity is one that we have spent time with in the Division III Steering Committee, which feels strongly that in Division III the principle of gender equity is not only compatible, but strongly encouraged by our philosophy.

We need to be very proactive in Division III in working toward greater gender equity in all elements of our activity, including the institutional self-study guide. Gender equity is a key issue, obviously. It probably is the most prominent item in the revisions of championships brackets. We feel that Division III is headed in the right direction, but I want to encourage further aggressiveness in pursuing this topic in all of our Division III activities.

President Whalen gave a Gender-Equity Task Force report yesterday and made some very good comments. I know that you have discussions in your conferences and elsewhere. I encourage you to speak on gender equity. This is a topic that is going to be with us for a long time.

Linda S. Moulton [Clark University (Massachusetts)]: What is your perception of what is taking place at those meetings? What kind of impact does this have for Division III? Is Division III included in the discussion? What are the issues that our membership is facing with gender equity? What kinds of discussions are taking place on your campus? Where is there confusion? What is it that we don't understand? What are institutions doing to try to address what you have identified as some of your concerns?

Those are a lot of questions. But those are things that we could share information about and ask questions. As a steering committee member and athletics director, I've heard comments from different people. There is a lot of information out there. Are we simply waiting to do anything because we need a definition? That might be one place to start. Could President Whalen and Judy discuss how they have seen the meetings for Division III? Are there issues that we could glean to help us be clear in our discussions and decisions on our campuses?

Ms. Sweet: On behalf of the task force, we appreciate input from the membership at this Convention. To make the right decisions, we need to know what the issues are from your perspective and what you see as viable options.

To answer your first question in regard to Division III and the task force discussions, to the best of my knowledge, there has not been

any differentiation on issues for Division I, Division II or Division III. Issues are issues.

What is being done that has significant impact on Division III focuses on the championships program, which the task force has some influence on. The NCAA Executive Committee is taking action, consistent with the recommendation from the task force, to try to increase championship opportunities for women. Beyond that, all of the other items are really in the discussion stages. It is incumbent upon everyone to try to let the task force know if there are unique concerns from Division III. Jim went over the various areas that are being addressed. If there are areas that the task force has overlooked that are of interest to Division III, this would be a good opportunity to have those identified.

James J. Whalen (Ithaca College): I agree with Judy. It is a very complex issue. We never talk about Division I or II or III in this. We are talking about our whole Association.

Judy mentioned that your ideas and suggestions are very important. We have received letters and commentary. It has been very helpful. I would like to stress that no action has been taken. There has been a lot of concern that something has already happened. It has not. We must remember that whenever we have had a tough issue, it has taken us some time. But we have gotten some resolution. I think we will, but we do need your help.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): I would like to throw a specific example in front of the Division III membership to get its reaction.

We have been given general parameters, but I went through an exercise at my institution where a newspaper reporter called me and two other Division II and Division I institutions in our area for budget figures for an article on whether women were getting a fair shake in local colleges. Being a naive Division III athletics director, I put my budget figures together and shipped them off. The other two institutions did not ship them their figures, so mine were the only ones that appeared in the paper. But the numbers that people saw bothered me. We had a staff meeting after that and a question was asked of me. Here is my predicament.

We have got 19 sports. When you take football out of the formula, we have nine men's sports and nine women's sports. We are still spending \$19,000 a year more on the nine men's sports than we are the nine women's sports. I can go one by one down the list and explain why, but at some point that does not cut it too well. For example, we have a men's junior varsity basketball program. We don't have a women's junior varsity basketball program. We have 45 men in track. We have 17 or 18 women in track. There is no comparable sport to wrestling. But at what point does this rhetoric stop being an explanation and get you into a gender-equity predicament?

I would like to hear the response of the membership to that type of situation, because I am hoping that it is fairly typical of Division III institutions. I think we are being fair. I am not sure how to adjust those numbers and still give everybody the same opportunity.

James Dimick (St. Olaf College): Something that might help is

the cost per participant. If you have one sport with 37 participants and the other one has 17, if the cost per participant is the same, I think that would reflect equity. I would hope Division III follows the guidelines outlined by Dick Schultz yesterday to reach equity and that we don't reduce the numbers in one sport to increase the numbers in the other.

I would like to give a specific example. I have a good friend who is a Division I basketball coach—Andy Baylock at the University of Connecticut. He had a baseball squad last year with something like 33 participants. He ran a junior varsity program with 24 games with absolutely no cost to the university. Andy teaches a course in umpiring. His student umpires officiated the games. They played all the games on campus. His students did all the field maintenance. He had players who raised money to buy the equipment with some fundraisers. Yet, he was informed that he would have to cut that JV program to reach a squad limit comparable to the softball program.

I hope that does not happen in Division III. My institution has a large baseball squad. But our softball team is not very large. I would like to see that softball team reach the same size and have a JV program like ours—because participation is the name of the game in Division III—but I hope we don't come to squad quotas to reach that.

Mr. Harvey: The point about cost per participant is an interesting one. I am sure that factor has been discussed by the task force.

Ms. Sweet: I would suggest if your institution has not done a Title IX review, that that is an important step to take and that you try to get some guidance from your district OCR (Office of Civil Rights) representatives on what is legally mandated.

I want to make a very important clarification. The Gender-Equity Task Force certainly cannot do anything that is contrary to Title IX. It is important to understand Title IX as a first step. The Gender-Equity Task Force may make recommendations that go a step further than Title IX, but the first step is to ensure compliance with Title IX.

Dennis A. Booher (Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales): We are probably one of the few colleges in the country that is considering adding football, as crazy as that may or may not be.

Could someone tell me what things I should be talking to my president about in considering adding football? I see football throwing it out of balance. Where do you add women's sports to bring football in and make it an equitable situation? Could someone respond to that?

Mr. Harvey: That is possibly the biggest part of the problem, trying to balance out those numbers.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): I know it is a corny word, but I heard Merrily Baker say it at the NACDA Convention. The question came from the floor about gender equity. She said one word—fairness. I think everyone here knows what fairness is.

I know that my neighbor did not go in the service and I did. Was that fair? But we know what fairness is in athletics. We know what is right and that is what we have to do. They can legislate all they want, but each institution has its own integrity. If the presidents really want to get on the bandwagon, now is the time to get on the bandwagon.

You are never going to find out what is equal as far as funds go. My golf program costs me more than any program because I divide it by seven golfers. Figures don't lie, but liars show figures. So somewhere in here, we are going to have to draw that line in the sand and we are going to have to stand up and tell them what fairness is. I hope we do that. I want to see the presidents do that. I want to see them come here and tell me what gender equity is. They are telling me everything else now. I want you to tell me that, too.

I want you to go back to your faculty and tell them they have two years before they make a change in your institution. I will tell you what they will say.

Mr. Harvey: The fairness has been voiced by many people. The other phrase that Merrily used in that same talk was "moral responsibility." To me, that was even more meaningful. We have a moral responsibility in building gender equity. So fairness and moral responsibility are things we should have in our minds and in our hearts.

Kenneth J. Weller [Central College (Iowa)]: I would like to urge all of us and the committees to recognize that there are significant differences between athletics in Division III and in Division I.

The balance between whether we serve students as spectators or whether we serve students as participants is very different. We certainly put the emphasis upon the participants, whereas Division I puts an emphasis upon spectators in terms of athletics. That says something pretty obvious to me about our concern and sensitivity to gender equity. We ought to be very, very interested in it. But I would also like to say that we are different in the context of what we do.

Let me illustrate. Certainly, one of the key issues that distinguishes our approach and Division I's approach is scholarships. We have none. And clearly, the point at which this is going to be binding in many cases is the amount of scholarship money given. Secondly, our approach in most cases is to look at athletics as a budgeted process of cocurricular activities for students as opposed to an autonomous, separate finance arrangement in Division I. And that makes a difference.

If you are looking at gender equity, it makes a great deal of sense in our institutions to look at gender equity not exclusively in terms of athletics, but in terms of the implications in the whole of cocurricular activities. For example, in the music department, there is a very clear distinction in a choir. You have twice as many altos and sopranos as you do tenors and basses. That is the way it naturally is going to be. But I think we have got to look at it in broad terms in being fair to our students, not only in athletics, but in all of the cocurricular opportunities that we provide.

And finally, in terms of cost consciousness, it is very different for us. One of the options to have cost containment is to cut squad sizes. If you cut squad sizes in Division I, you save yourself a lot of money. If you cut squad sizes in our institutions, in many cases you cut your revenues more than you do your expenses. It is a very different implication for Division III. I therefore think it is incumbent on us to be sensitive and to talk about gender equity as it affects our students

and institutions and recognize it may be significantly different than the implications of gender equity in Division I.

Mr. Harvey: The point about Division III's uniqueness as institutions and Division III's uniqueness in philosophy were well underscored.

James J. Whalen (Ithaca College): I am reminded of Franklin Roosevelt, who said: "We have nothing to fear, but fear itself."

We are so used to legislation. We are so used to quotas and numbers. We are a very, very diverse group of institutions. I think it would become very difficult to provide any legislation that is going to cover every institution in gender equity. What we are trying to do is to look at as many models as possible. I am not sure that \$19,000 spent on a program in men's sports over women's sports is an inequity. One would not know that until one looked at the entire program, the people who participate in it, the opportunities for people to participate.

So equity is going to be something that we will define as carefully as we can. We are going to try to present ideas that some campuses have used to bring more equity to their program. Believe me, this is something that is going to take us a few years. But I do believe that we will accomplish it. We cannot be too concrete and too legislative at this point. It won't work. People have very, very different points of view. We have got to bring them together carefully or we are not going to have the solution that I think we can have in a reasonable amount of time.

I would like people to open their minds a little bit; to look a little more globally at programs and be a little less concerned with absolute numbers and formulas and specifics. Because, as somebody said, we know what is fair. Our committee talked about fairness. What is fairness? And that is what we are trying to do; to get there as best we can. Is football a problem? Yes, football is a problem. Will it have to be dealt with? Yes, it will be dealt with. How? I do not know, but it will be dealt with, as will all of the other aspects.

So we do need your help. But I see no reason for our anxiety levels to get too high. Those who keep the anxiety level down will probably help us a little more than those who don't.

[The Division III business session was recessed at 11:45 a.m.]

Friday Morning, January 15, 1993

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. with Division III Vice-President John Harvey, Carnegie Mellon University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Harvey: Our first item today is the Executive Committee report.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Executive Committee

Mary R. Barrett (University of Massachusetts, Boston): Approval of a record operating budget and the conduct of a comprehensive study of the NCAA championships program were among the most significant actions taken by the Executive Committee during 1991-92.

In total, 59.4 percent of the budget represented direct payments to membership; 23.5 percent represented benefits to members, and 4.5 percent represented benefits to students and youth. Upon the recommendation of the Budget Subcommittee, the Executive Committee also affirmed that the budget would be balanced each year with revenues available during each fiscal year rather than transferring moneys from the funded operating reserve to balance the budget. Other budget items included an increase in the membership trust to two percent of the television rights fees from CBS Sports.

Also, the Executive Committee extended its August 1992 meeting by a full day to permit long-range planning relative to the future of the entire championships program. At that meeting, the committee reviewed the results of a survey of the membership and concluded that the following factors necessitated a basic change in the championships program: 1. Interest in achieving gender equity throughout the program; 2. Interest in increased access for nonautomatic-qualifying conferences; 3. The need to address the subjective nature of the championships decision-making process, and 4. The need to treat financial considerations—both Association and institutional concerns and priorities—equitably.

In August, the Executive Committee reached consensus on several principles that would guide its deliberations and actions on championship matters. Among them: That the championship program is a priority of the Association relative to other programs and services and that the enhancement of the championship program and the revenue-distribution plan were not mutually exclusive; that men's and women's championships should be treated equitably in terms of field sizes, per diem allowances and official traveling party expenses; that championship formats should place emphasis on quality competition for elite teams and for student-athletes while providing appropriate access for conferences, taking into consideration the financial applications of such access, and that consideration should be given to establishing sponsorship levels to determine the treatment and the continuation of championships as well as the establishment of new championships. The Executive Committee's timetable called for the development of plans during the fall of 1992-93 to apply these principles to the championships program, wait a period of time for review and comment from the membership, and then recommend final action in May of 1993.

Additional matters that were conducted by the Executive Committee included the format for the annual Convention. The revised format was approved effective with the 1993 Convention and established a Presidential Agenda Day in order that legislative proposals of greatest interest to chief executive officers could be acted upon in one day. In addition, the Executive Committee approved several criteria for the designation of future Convention sites. Most notable among those were that the Convention would not be held in areas that permit gambling, either casino or open sports book; that the Convention would be held in a city whose most recent approval rating was at least 60 percent, and that the opening business session be conducted on the first Sunday after January 6 each year. The Executive Com-

mittee also approved the following future Convention sites: 1994, San Antonio, Texas; 1995, San Diego, California; and 1997, Nashville.

In the area of playing-rules changes, for which the Executive Committee maintains oversight authority for rules in the areas of cost, safety or image of the sport, the following actions were taken: Sustained the decisions of the Men's and Women's Basketball Rules Committees to prohibit the use of basketball gloves and remanded to those committees and to the Football Rules Committee for further consideration the issue of commercial logos on playing surfaces; approved an exception to the rule requiring the use of a 25-second clock for Division III football; approved a change in the wrestling rules to specify that a participant who is rendered unconscious may not be permitted to continue in the match after regaining consciousness without the approval of a physician; denied the recommendation that the three-man officiating system be mandated as the exclusive officiating system for intercollegiate men's ice hockey, but noted that a sports committee could mandate a specific system to be used in NCAA championships competition, and approved the recommended depth of 16 feet as the required plummet depth for 10-meter platform diving. Those are some of the sports-specific rules.

The Executive Committee also approved several changes in policies and procedures relating to the administration of the NCAA championships program. Included in those were requiring the host institution for NCAA championships to enter into a performance agreement with the official NCAA concessionaire, setting forth minimum standards that must be met to enhance the sale and administration of concession items.

Also approved were several revisions in per diem policies; most notably, that if a host institution's on-campus dining and residence facilities are open during the competition, the host would receive one-half day's per diem rather than the full per diem for its participating teams or individuals. Revisions in policies for treating misconduct situations also were approved as were policies intended to provide greater consistency and fiscal responsibility in the conduct of sport polls. Most of the actions that centered on Division III directed sports committees to conduct regional polls rather than national polls. Recommendations from the championships committee relative to the concept of the enhancement of a regionalization concept of competition also were approved.

The most recent Executive Committee meeting was held in December. There were many budgetary items that were reported on, many of which you will find in NCAA Annual Reports. The agenda for legislation also was approved. You received notification of the pieces of legislation that were supported by the Executive Committee.

As a part of the Executive Committee action, we very much depend on the input of the championships committees and the membership as far as any of the fiscal matters are concerned. So we endorse the concept of what the championships committees have recommended to you. We look forward to more discussion today. That will be included in the consideration of what is finally acted upon at the 1993 May meeting of the Executive Committee.

**Special Committee to Review the NCAA
Division III Institutional Self-Study Guide**

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): The fifth NCAA special Convention, which was held in June of 1985, made mandatory as an obligation of membership that each institution conduct a comprehensive self-study of its intercollegiate athletic programs at least once every five years.

This document became known as the Institutional Self-Study Guide or the ISSG. Upon receipt of this document, some of you read it then rushed to complete it and get it out of the way. Others, like myself, read it, filed it away and said: "Well, I don't have to worry about this for another five years." And a few of you did nothing at all. Left it there. And at the end of five years, you got a letter of reprimand from the NCAA. You were told to get on the stick if you wanted to remain a member of the Association.

No matter what action we initially took, I am sure we all agree that the document—the ISSG—was not really applicable to Division III. So this past June, a special committee was formed. It embarked on the task of making the ISSG relevant to Division III. The document has gone through several revisions. All references to divisions other than Division III were removed. It has been reduced in length. Input was gained from athletics administrators who were not members of the initial committee. I would again like to express our thanks and appreciation for those of you who sent something back to us. We used the information you gave us to make it a better document.

Since the document has been published in The NCAA News, it has been mailed to the campuses for review by your CEOs, your faculty representatives and your athletics administrators. Unlike the certification that was adopted yesterday by Proposal No. 15 in Division I, the ISSG does not contain any provisions for external peer reviewers to come to your campus and to look through your athletics records; nor will the document have any cost for undertaking that study.

The Division III ISSG that we now have has been designed specifically to assist Division III member institutions in assessing the role of athletics on the institution's educational missions. It still fulfills the NCAA constitutional requirement, and it must be done at least once every five years.

WAIVERS

[Note: The Division III business session heard petitions for waivers of Division III membership criteria from Agnes Scott College, Beaver College, Endicott College, and Wesleyan College. The petitions were approved.]

[The meeting was recessed for 10 minutes.]

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

[Note: The slate for Division III representatives to the Council was approved as presented.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Professional Enhancement Programs

William E. Lide (Salisbury State University): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit coaches and administrators to participate in established formal professional enhancement programs such as the NFL Minority Coaches Fellowship Program and will be of benefit to all individuals and organizations that participate.

The Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee feels that formal professional enhancement programs of this nature are vital to our profession. This proposal will permit all athletics department members to participate in well-established, tightly defined and implemented formal professional enhancement programs and allow the participants to receive compensation and expenses consistent with that received by other program participants.

It further suggests that the Council establish necessary policies and guidelines regarding participation in such programs and that these guidelines could be set by the Council through various NCAA committees.

[Proposal No. 66 (Page A-87) was approved by Division III.]

Individual Eligibility—Graduate Student

Marjorie B. Giles (Central College (Iowa)): I move Proposal No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council supports this proposal because it feels that it will encourage individuals to graduate rather than put off commencement to be able to participate in athletics.

[Proposal No. 77 (Page A-96) was approved by Division III.]

Academic Honor Awards—Division III

Ms. Giles: On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal confirms that nonacademic criteria such as interviews and essays may be included in the administration of Division III academic honor awards. These criteria, however, still may not be based on athletics ability or participation. Further, the additional criteria must apply to all students. The Division III Steering Committee believes that this legislation is consistent with the existing legislation related to academic honors awards and will not be subject to abuse.

I urge you to adopt this proposal.

Robert Bierie (Loras College): The concern with the proposal as it currently is stated is the potential for abuse.

Regretfully, many of the NCAA Manual policies are there to deter abuse and to address those issues. Presently, Bylaw 15.4.6.2.1, as it is stated in the Manual, has very objective criteria. This is a rather loose interpretation now to include a written essay or an interview to compensate a student-athlete, regardless of need.

For example, a student-athlete with an ACT of 20 who has met the 3.500 grade-point average, a no-need student, receives an academic award of \$5,000. The question is, is this consistent with other students who have a similar ACT, GPA or class rank? No. Were they awarded more? Yes. What is the reason? Because they did one heck of a job in a personal interview. If you will note, Bylaw 15.4.6.4—

Nonathletics Achievement Awards—if an institution chooses to compensate, regardless of need, those who excel in a personal interview or in a written essay, they have the option to do so. Awards described in Bylaws 15.4.6.4 and 15.4.6.3 are subject to the approval of the Council. You have to submit an institution's specified criteria as to how they will be awarded. Bylaw 15.4.6.4 does not. If you meet any one of the three, you are leaving the door wide open. If you allow this, it is going to be open season.

Ms. Giles: You still must be consistent in the handling of your financial aid policy within your own institution. If you have essays for one, you have essays for others. You still have to justify why a certain student would receive financial aid that is inconsistent. All financial aid given must be consistent within your institution.

Harlan Knosher (Knox College): I am also speaking for the Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference, a group of 12 schools. I would like to give just a touch of history about the conference as it relates to this particular issue.

The Midwest Conference disallowed athletics scholarships in 1955, 20 years before the beginning of Division III. Currently and since that time, the Midwest Conference has disallowed coaches going on the road to recruit, permits athletics scheduling in all sports less than NCAA standards except in the sport of cross country and is clearly committed to principles of Division III, having committed to Division III at its inception. The Midwest Conference is not into over-emphasis.

On that basis, I hope that it makes sense to say that the belief of our conference and certainly of the institution I represent, is that failure to support Proposal No. 92 would constitute taking a position discriminatory to student-athletes in Division III. At all of our schools, some of the very finest potential students also are athletes. At most of our schools, prospective students are eligible for financial recognition because of their academic excellence. Many admissions committees and faculties find that these awards must be based on more than test scores and grade-point averages. They don't mean athletics ability. They mean essays. They mean faculty interviews. And they mean to keep these criteria in place. If being judged by these means an athlete will be ruled ineligible, we are essentially saying that an athlete is out of the running for these awards. This would be discrimination of the first order.

Some of you are concerned that in some way athletics ability will seep into this process and become part of the consideration in making these awards. The Midwest Conference shares these apprehensions, but resists the idea that discriminating against the student-athlete is the appropriate way to deal with these concerns. If we want to be fair to the student-athlete in Division III, as is our uppermost mission, we need to support Proposal No. 92.

[Proposal No. 92 (Page A-107) was approved by Division III.]

Nonathletics Achievement Awards

George M. Harmon (Millsaps College): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 93.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal merely codifies criteria used by the Division III Steering Committee to review and approve nonathletics achievement awards. It specifies that recipients of nonathletics achievement awards must be selected by a committee of the faculty of an academic department, division or school of the institution. It also specifies that an athletics department staff member may not be a member of that committee. There was some confusion in the applications we were receiving over the wording "administration of the award by a department" and so on. The intent was to have awards in academic areas where the selection would be by the faculty rather than by some administrative process.

Starkey Duncan (University of Chicago): I understand that the criteria with regard to this issue are important. However, I wonder about the way that this particular proposal has been set up.

One example would be that members of the dean of students staff could not participate in the awarding of various awards such as volunteer student of the year and that sort of thing. The other thing is that interpretations may exist with respect to this. However, no distinction is made with regard to members of an athletics department who also are faculty members in the university or in the college. I would like some clarification on that second point.

Mr. Harvey: Let me make one clarification. The committee could include people from the dean of students office. The wording, as I see it, is "a committee composed predominantly of faculty."

Mr. Harmon: I think the intent is clear. It has been all along. No one involved in the athletics department or administration would be a part of the selection process.

Mr. Duncan: That clarifies the issue. It does not answer the concern.

Allen F. Ackerman (University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh): Just a point of clarification. It says "composed predominantly of a group of faculty." At our institution, our chancellor makes this decision. How would that be defined? Our chancellor makes some of these awards.

Mr. Harmon: That is exactly what we were trying to avoid. I'm not against chancellors, but some applications were submitted where the provost would approve them. If we go back in history, the whole intent was to have a student who did not meet need criteria, who does not necessarily meet academic criteria, who is an outstanding musician, but happens to be an athlete as well. You were discriminating against that person in giving aid either because he had no need or no academic criteria, but you needed him for athletics.

If he were an athlete, he could not receive aid. So the whole process was developed to take care of these sorts of cases and to assure that it was to be decided on those criteria by a group composed primarily of faculty in the academic area rather than athletics or a chancellor's office. The chancellor could be on this selection committee. There is no question about that.

Susan Petersen Lubow (U.S. Merchant Marine Academy): I appreciate everything that I have heard. Philosophically, I believe what they are trying to do, only I have difficulty with the fact that athletics department included the department of physical education. At my

institution. I consider myself a faculty member. It is unjust for those institutions that have physical education faculty who also happen to be coaches to be excluded from the opportunity of being considered a faculty member in an academic area. As far as I am concerned, I am in an academic area. I should have the opportunity to be on a committee.

Mr. Harmon: Again, you could be on the committee that admits the student. But all of that has to be washed out in awarding aid.

You can use athletics—any kind of thing like that—in terms of admitting students and attracting them to your institution. But given all the legislation in Division III, the concern was having athletics ability or participation somehow creeping into the decision on financial aid. This whole thing was developed in response to the membership wanting some way to not discriminate against someone who just happened to be an athlete.

Ms. Petersen Lubow: All right. Maybe I misunderstood. I thought you had mentioned achievement award or an award given by the institution. I wanted to make sure that we have the opportunity to be on a committee as a faculty member.

[Proposal No. 93 (Page A-108) was approved by Division III.]

Playing and Practice Seasons

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): I would like to move Proposal No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

With Council approval, institutions are permitted to designate one men's sport and one women's sport in which the NCAA does not sponsor a championship to meet divisional sports sponsorship criteria.

However, those sports must meet the criteria and the requirements of Bylaw 17 in regard to the length of practice and playing season. Currently, those sports in which the NCAA does not sponsor championships must count all postseason championships against their declared practice and playing seasons while the NCAA championship sports may exempt one postseason championship from their practice and playing seasons.

This amendment will establish the same practice and playing season exemptions for nonchampionship sports that are permitted for championship sports. I urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 96 (Page A-110) was approved by Division III.]

First Contest Date—Cross Country, Field Hockey and Water Polo

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): I move Proposal No. 103-C.

[The motion was seconded.]

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): This proposal applies to institutions that sponsor water polo. It makes the starting date for competition for Division III members consistent with Division I and II rules. This is just a housekeeping amendment to bring all three divisions in line.

[Part C of Proposal No. 103 (Page A-119) was approved by Division III, 154-39, 51 abstentions.]

Resolution: Division III Men's and Women's Soccer
Curtis W. Tong (Pomona-Pitzer Colleges): I move Resolution No. 155.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is the primary purpose of this resolution to encourage the sports committee of soccer in particular and the championship committee also to give consideration of soccer interests. Foremost, this resolution urges greater latitude in playing time to those thousands of students in Division III who play soccer. The present October deadline date for selections to championship play unduly limits regular seasons from running their course. It seems to some of us that reserving about one-third of the potential season for championship rounds places too great of a disparity in the balance of interests for soccer-playing students. We urge consideration by the appropriate committees to review the present structure of the soccer season.

[Resolution No. 155 (Page A-163) was approved by Division III.]

DISCUSSION

Championships

Mr. Harvey: Our next item of business is a discussion on championships. There are not current crises, but further directions to the championships committee and to ourselves are needed.

Mary R. Barrett (University of Massachusetts, Boston): It is a special treat to have Donna Noonan, NCAA director of championships with us. Donna's input, guidance and wisdom in terms of discussing, researching and clarifying issues are invaluable, so we are delighted to have her with us.

If you have been reading The NCAA News, you realize that this year the Division III championships committee has taken some very bold stands on some issues. We thought that it was extremely important to present some current thoughts of your committee to you, the membership. At the end of the individual presentations, we invite your questions, your response and your concerns.

This promises to be a very interesting year and a very proactive year for Division III. So to assist the discussions today, we have a copy of the principles that we have developed in our discussions this year. This is what we are currently thinking. We welcome additional thoughts and additional principles and goals. We have a reprint from The NCAA News and a very interesting chart that explains the direction we have taken.

To reiterate briefly the introductory remarks in terms of championship principles for Division III, we really need your consideration. These are the things we see as the major points to emphasize.

Point No. 1. The national championships competition should continue, but Division III is strongly emphasizing a regionalization philosophy. We are also very concerned about any problems you may have experienced in the championships selection criteria that sports committees or advisory committees have used.

No. 2. I want the membership to be assured that your comments are very welcome. We forward them and they usually result in refinement of the process or at least clarification and explanation of the process. Not everyone gets everything that they want. But there

should be a good feeling in terms of the process.

No. 3. We feel very strongly that we are about where we should be, so we want to continue current per diem allowances.

No. 4. Sports sponsorship to the Division III committee is extremely important. Compared to the Divisions I and II championship committee reports, we feel that we have some very strong numbers that really need attention. We especially are concerned about the issue of gender equity. As you see on your charts, we have made a very bold move in terms of attempting to address those issues.

No. 5. As part of the materials that will be discussed and considered and acted upon in terms of recommendations next May, we will be looking at materials that we will discuss today about the declining numbers in some championships. We have a particular interest in Division III sports sponsorship numbers in men's ice hockey. If the current numbers are used, it could definitely be in difficulty.

So your championships committee is endorsing a revision of the numbers to accommodate all of our programs. This needs to be discussed and addressed to make the agenda for the next Convention.

Without further ado, I would like to introduce Sam Bedrosian, the director of athletics at Aurora University. He will discuss the regionalization concept.

Sam S. Bedrosian (Aurora University): I call your attention to Principle No. 1 in the hand-out cited by Mary Barrett. The national championships competition should continue to be conducted. However, in Division III, the regionalization philosophy in the ranking and selection of teams should be affirmed. Our committee agrees with both segments within this principle. We believe that we reflect the current wishes of the Division III membership.

The purpose of my remarks is threefold: One, to inform Division III members what your championships committee has been doing this past year; two, to elicit your feedback as to your perceptions of the actions we have taken, and three, to encourage constructive comments regarding the direction you wish the committee to follow in 1993. We want your input whether it arrives today, tomorrow or in the near future, but certainly before our next meeting, which will be in early May.

In May of 1991, the championships committee focused on its principle of regionalization by approving the following statement concerning the selection of participants for championships: "The Division III championships philosophy is to field the most competitive teams possible while minimizing missed class time, to emphasize regional competition in regular-season scheduling and to provide regional representation to NCAA championships competition by allocating specific berths per region or by regional pairings and seedings, realizing that this may be done at the expense of leaving out some championship caliber teams."

During this past year and as recently as December of 1992, we have received and reviewed procedures from all of the governing sports committees in Division III. I can assure you that we have not assumed the role of dictating to governing sports committees about how they should apply the regionalization philosophy to their specif-

ic assignments. However, in those instances deemed appropriate, we have asked committees to explain actions that we believed to be inconsistent with the intent of the regionalization philosophy. As an outgrowth of that, some adjustments have been made.

An important spinoff issue within the Division III regionalization philosophy was the need, cost and the validity of national polls conducted by governing sports committees. As a result of discussion and data from the national office staff, we concluded that effective with the 1992-93 academic year, polls conducted within Division III by governing sports committees or subcommittees should be regional in nature, not national. I believe the committee has applied this decision consistently throughout the current academic year. We recognize that organizations and associations could or already have conducted national polls on behalf of certain Division III sports, but it is our contention that regional polls conducted by governing sports committees provide for the objectives sought within the selection procedures.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that we are sensitive and very receptive to your comments regarding the intent and the application of the regionalization principle.

Ms. Barrett: Next we will hear from Arthur Eason, director of athletics at William Paterson College, on the selection and automatic qualification criteria for championships.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): One of the major tasks of a sports committee is selecting participants for postseason play. To aid them in this difficult and sometimes thankless task, we unfortunately have not been able to give them the wisdom of Solomon. But we do try to help them to some degree and ask that they stay with the Division III regionalization philosophy that Sam spoke about while also asking them to be consistent in the application of ranking and selection criteria. We want them to review the team records in terms of wins and losses, strength of schedule, and the eligibility and availability of student-athletes at those institutions for championships.

In spite of their efforts, there is a great deal of disappointment sometimes and even bitterness when an institution finds it has not been selected for postseason tournaments. Some of you might feel it would be easier if we went to automatic qualifications to determine who goes and who does not go. This will help the conferences, but what about the independents? Bylaw 31.3 4.2.1 on automatic-qualification criteria states in part that conference competition must be conducted in a sport, with a champion determined by the date of selection to the championship. It goes on to state that conferences may subdivide and conduct a round-robin competition within each subdivision plus a postseason tournament. Conferences must have eligibility rules at least as stringent as those of the NCAA. Competition must be of sufficient quality, and all eligible members must agree to participate in the appropriate championship.

This summer, the NCAA membership was surveyed regarding championship issues. One of the questions that was asked was: "Do you believe the current criteria and guidelines for awarding auto-

matic qualifications should be revised or automatic qualification awarded on some other basis? If so, what?" The first part was simple. All we had to do was give a yes or no answer. Some of you felt that yes, it should be; or no, it should not be. But then the complications came in when we asked if so, what? However, some of you continued to fill out the survey. These were the results.

Approximately 80 of the respondents believed that the current criteria were appropriate or generally appropriate, with some qualifying comments. Of those, 10 believed regionalized competition should be included. Forty respondents believed changes are needed. Nineteen would like to see play-ins introduced. Twelve thought automatics should be eliminated, while three wanted to see regional rather than conference competition given greater emphasis. Three believed automatics should be given to all member conferences. At this point, we asked what do you think? Which way should we go?

Needless to say, the survey was not conclusive. We have to remember in Division III, only basketball, soccer, softball and women's volleyball have automatics. So your input is vitally needed as to the automatic qualifications.

Ms. Barrett: John Harvey is going to discuss the implications of gender equity

Mr. Harvey: As a member of the championships committee, I participated in these discussions. One of the major efforts that we have been making is to achieve greater gender equity as we talk about revisions of the championships program for Division III.

There have been some disparities in the past. From this point forward, we are applying principle No. 4 on your list—to achieve greater gender equity as we pursue changes. On one of the charts you received, you will see the sports sponsorship percentages with our revisions and our proposals to the Executive Committee. Funding is primarily based upon sports sponsorship and brackets are based on the sponsorship figures.

A summary of those parts of our proposals to the Executive Committee are these: We proposed that the women's basketball bracket be increased by eight teams to a total of 40 teams to make it equal with the men's. As you see, the men's sponsorship is 96 percent of the institutions. Women's sponsorship is 95 percent. That is very close. Therefore, we feel the brackets ought to be the same at 40.

In the volleyball bracket, we are proposing an increase by eight teams to make it equal with baseball and men's soccer. These three sports are at almost exactly the same sponsorship level among Division III institutions. I believe volleyball is 90 percent, soccer is 87 percent, baseball is 86 percent. Even though the sports perhaps are not comparable, the bracket size or the sponsorship levels are. Therefore, we are proposing that volleyball be increased by eight teams.

In the softball bracket, we are proposing an increase by four teams, considering its 76 percent sponsorship. Moving over to individual sports, we are proposing three increases to achieve equity. One is in women's cross country, where we are proposing 48 additional positions. Also, in women's outdoor track, we are proposing

the addition of 69 additional positions, and women's tennis, an increase of 12. Totally, this amounts to a proposal for an addition of 20 teams and 131 individuals in order to achieve this equity.

We are not proposing any decrease on the men's side. We are proposing increases on the women's side for that purpose. This is going to cost money. We are going a little bit against the tide with the Executive Committee by proposing increases, but we feel that this is justified in Division III. We have not had an inflated championships situation in any sport, and we feel there are disparities that need to be addressed. Even though the increases are somewhat costly, they are justified. We are making that case to the Executive Committee as part of the total proposal this spring. We are very hopeful that we will not only have a good hearing, but achieve the results we are after.

Ms. Barrett: At this point, it would be appropriate to ask our membership if it would like to discuss any point further or perhaps ask any specific questions.

Victor A. Clark (Thomas More College): I understand the equity issues and agree totally with the expansion of the brackets. I know that all is in the spirit of cost containment. Yet in our opening remarks, I heard that the NCAA financial picture is healthier than it has ever been. But the membership struggles on a different type of budget that does not concern championships.

My question is specifically directed at Division III football, where we have less than seven percent of the teams playing football that would be selected for postseason play. Being a football coach, I have a vested interest in this area after not being selected for postseason play a year ago with an undefeated team. That raised some real hackles from our side. The rationale was that a second-year program should not be worthy to be in postseason play. That did not make any sense to me at that time. Strength of schedule was the other argument. That may have had some validity.

We were successful again this year, but there was a great deal of maneuvering and a lot of politicking that had to go on to become a known entity. Looking at the limited bracketing in football, is there a reason why 229 schools that do participate should be limited to seven percent participation in postseason play? Are we being equitable and fair to those hundreds of football players who will not be able to fairly compete for a championship?

Donna J. Noonan (NCAA): I think the concern is the number of games that it would take to expand the bracket. If you went to 32 or to 24, you are adding another week into the season. From all of the responses the committee has gotten, there was not a lot of interest in that.

There is a lot of discussion with Division III football about going to regional championships. That is something that is on the table. It is not part of this plan, but it has been under discussion among the committee members.

Ms. Barrett: We have heard from some folks this year in terms of the selection process and committee activity and standardization criteria. Those letters and those comments have been appropriately ad-

dressed and are part of an ongoing work project. We do welcome the feedback.

James Dimick (St. Olaf College): I was in Atlanta for a week. It overlapped with the football coaches' convention. I would say that I heard many, many football coaches express concern. I am not so sure that they would agree with not extending the season for one week. I think the football coaches really feel strongly about this.

Ms. Barrett: If that is correct, then I assume that what you are saying probably represents some good numbers. I think that the appropriate committees will hear about that working through the football committee.

People should be encouraged to address their concerns in writing with some of the more salient features of their concerns to your director of championships and to me as chair of the committee. We would welcome those.

Sherry Calvert (Whittier College): I would like to applaud the work and recommendations of the committee in terms of gender equity.

However, I do have one question. The Division III track and field subcommittee has received numerous requests for adding women's events to both the indoor and outdoor championship, which would provide an equal number of event opportunities to men and women. This has been impossible in the past due to the existing numbers we have had to deal with. Assuming the event differential for men and women led to the decision to not add participants to the women's indoor championship while adding to the outdoor championship—continuing a disparity by nearly 40 athletes, the difference between men's and women's participants—is there now an opportunity for the subcommittee to approach the championships committee requesting both an equal number of events and an equal number of participants as you have done in all other individual sports?

Ms. Barrett: I understand that. We are mindful at this point in terms of the proposal that we have put forward, as you see it represented in these charts. We are mindful of that. I think in our collective efforts as your committee, that we have tried to address the factors that demand an immediate response, keeping in mind the numbers and the costs.

The database that we are using in terms of the total sports sponsorship situation seems to be more equitably distributed among all of the sports. I think the members are giving us that feedback and that they think that is the case. But I do understand your comment. We will take a look at that working through the committees.

Ms. Noonan: The Division III track and field subcommittee could request that the championships committee take a look at adding events. The timetable is for this plan to go to the Executive Committee this May. So I would suggest if those committees have that request, to get it to the Executive Committee for consideration during the May meeting.

Ms. Barrett: The May meeting has a very full agenda. It really deals with a lot of financial requests. If anyone has a particular concern, the earlier the materials come in, the better we can do on con-

sidering them and doing the research that is necessary. As you read the fine print for Division III, we are looking for additional funds for the things that we believe in and that we believe you want. So we need to be very wise in terms of how we address our requests and the documentation that we use. So I would urge any group that has a concern to write early and often.

John D. Galaris (Salem State College): I have a couple of thoughts that I think are important.

In the area of automatic qualifiers, we are totally incongruent in the division as to how we handle them. We have a number of team championships in which there are none. Perhaps the most blatant example is in terms of how many the men's basketball committee gives. It can give up to 50 percent of the slots. I think that is an issue that we as a division need to look at. I am not sure why the incongruence exists. It seems either we should be giving automatics or we should not. It should not be up to individual committees to make the decision. That is a national decision. The Steering Committee needs to give us some direction on that, because we are all over the parking lot.

Ms. Barrett: That is fair to say. The committee would reiterate that this has not been necessarily an easy analysis because there is a difference of opinion in terms of automatic qualification and the numbers that are awarded.

Within the membership, there are some who would strongly propose that and there are others who are concerned because of their independent nature.

So there is a wide range of opinions on that. That has been wrestled with at all three divisions, because there are some situations that had certain votes prevail. It would automatically almost close up any opportunity. It would all be automatic qualifiers, which did not satisfy several members or would have left out some members. Some conferences have been very aggressive about the number of qualifiers. So there is a disparity.

Mr. Galaris: You are absolutely right. We have discussed it even within our committee. There is a disparity. I recognize that. That is why I suggest that it is really a national issue. It is not a committee issue. We are going to need some direction. I think we appropriately not only need it, we should have that.

A colleague and good friend was chair of the baseball committee, which gives no automatic qualifiers. Yet I sit as a member on the basketball committee and we can give up to 50 percent of our slots away. I don't understand this, and I don't understand why it continues. So that is one thought.

I do have a second thought in terms of selection criteria, particularly as it applies to team sports. We tend to get very ambiguous with what those are. There are some written criteria in the book. They vary from sport to sport. I am not sure they have to. One of the criteria that I find particularly troublesome—I don't care which sport we talk about—is a concept called strength of schedule. Unless we are prepared to publish what that is in a national way so that all member institutions can understand what you mean by strength of

schedule—you meaning each committee, because if you talk to different committees, you get very different answers—I don't think you can use that.

Ms. Barrett: That is a problem that, quite honestly, we are addressing. We find that even within materials that we have forwarded to various committees asking them to do certain things that sometimes the message is not going forward. That is a good point. It is a legitimate point. Some of the things that we are talking about in terms of more focus on regional play may eliminate some of the emphasis that folks have set in terms of strength of schedule, which has encouraged them to perhaps go out of their region or think that they had to in terms of the strength of the schedule.

We also have heard from some committees that have had a problem with some of their fellow committees in other areas; that the criteria has not been used consistently. So we are aware of those problems and welcome feedback on them.

Mr. Eason: When you receive a survey, try to fill it out. We are looking for whatever input that you could give us on those things.

When we survey the membership and half of you don't bother to give us any input, we don't know. That is why we are trying to get the feedback we feel is vital.

Do we want automatics, or how do we go? Until that is decided, we are going to remain in the situation that we are in. So, whatever you can do. I know many of us are flooded with paperwork. We get a survey, and drop it in the basket. Or Sabrina, my assistant, I give it to her to take care of. But sooner or later, we got to get to it. We got to answer. Because people are depending upon that information to come back so they can try to put together a plan.

Sheila K. Wallace Kovalchik (Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association): I wondered if the sport committees might simply look carefully at the time frame and the dates that they utilize for soliciting information for automatic qualifiers. Over the holidays, we had a request for three different sports. Many of our coaches are part-time. They are not in during that time. It was very difficult to compile those and have them back before this Convention.

Ms. Barrett: Good suggestion.

[The Division III business session was recessed at noon.]

Friday Afternoon, January 15, 1993

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with Mr. Harvey presiding.

Mr. Harvey: Will the delegates begin to take their seats, so we can begin the afternoon session?

I will turn it back to Mary Barrett again for resumption of our discussion on championships.

DISCUSSION

Championships

Ms. Barrett: I had a chance at lunchtime to speak with some people in attendance this morning. Some of the issues that people are concerned about are individual in nature and might be addressed to

the individual sports committees. So if we could keep this a little bit more general in terms of common interest, that would be appreciated.

Gregory L. Lockard (Montclair State College): I wish I had spoken this morning before you said that. But I did want to take a second to speak on behalf of the College Swimming Coaches Association. I am the current executive director.

Swimming is a little bit different. I know track has similar interests. I cannot speak on their behalf, but I think they would echo some of these comments. We are different. We have had some tough times in getting to the 1-16 ratio. I think that would probably be acceptable. It is a capping system that really has made it difficult, and quite frankly, has changed the nature of the way we get to our championship. It has affected the sport so much that teams have to prepare differently and have end-of-the-season concerns. I would ask this committee to look at that and strongly consider letting us go ahead and be smaller.

We understand the financial constraints. But possibly look at letting us be a little bit more individual and not try to fit into a mold, because you cannot do that. I think track has similar concerns. Swimming is really a unique sport. Some of you up there have heard it too many times. I would ask the membership to talk to the swimming coaches and try to understand. It certainly is a big group. Many of you are involved in the sport. It is an important sport to Division III, without question.

It would be good if our sport committees—team and individual sports—could get together. You have given us an audience, but continue to give us an audience to try to work out some of our championship sites. It is my belief—and a lot of other sport chairs' and executive directors'—that we can save money by rotating sites appropriately and by working with the air fares. There are some air fares that are ridiculous. I think we can save a lot of money there.

So possibly condense it. Save money. Give us a chance to still meet the maximum numbers, but not affect the sport with caps.

Ms. Barrett: The swim coaches have been very interested and have shared their concerns. I would welcome additional information, Greg, at any time, so please don't hesitate to articulate your concerns.

Maxwell F. Taylor (Colorado College): I wanted to call the attention of this group to a concern that perhaps other independents have.

My concern does not deal with the selection of independents for postseason play. That is working very well. Rather, it concerns the criteria used in site selection for postseason play. Let me cite the example that we experienced this year. Our men's soccer team for the first time in 25 years was very, very successful in terms of postseason play. We were the No. 1 seed in the West. In spite of that—because of the criteria for site selection, which in descending order stresses cost to the NCAA, suitability of facilities and then, third, seating—we were forced to play three straight weekends under a very demanding academic program on the road.

I would hope in the review of championships, that some consideration could be given to the plight of the independent. It is very unlike-

ly that an independent school—since we are located in Colorado, there are no other Division III schools—will ever be in proximity to other institutions that we could host in the interests of saving money for the NCAA. We have got to balance the impact on the lives of our young people academically over cost to the NCAA.

William E. Lide (Salisbury State University): I want to express concern with the regionalization concept and selection criteria.

It is very important to institutions in a specific geographical area to play institutions in that region. One selection criteria is teams' strength of schedule. Teams they want you to play may be outside of your specific region. You cannot play them because of cost-containment issues and time demands. I hope that the committee will give even greater focus to regionalization and cost containment and stick with that rather than saying that your schedule was not strong enough because you did not play the top seven schools outside of your region.

Another issue I wanted to raise is to perhaps look at the regions that some schools are in. You might be eight hours away. Your region can span that gamut. There are regions that are much closer. That is an issue of cost containment, too. Division III institutions should be very concerned about that.

Ms. Barrett: Those factors seem to be a part of the continuing discussion. I will assure you that the emphasis on regionalization is getting a good deal of attention. That is the wave of the future. We hope that the message will go forward to all the appropriate people.

Sherry Calvert (Whittier College): I suggest that your committee might make a great deal of progress in the consistent application of gender equity if we were to look at the numbers in men's and women's swimming and add men to that championship since there seems to be a disparity of eight male athletes, if the numbers you have presented to us are correct, in order to bring that championship equal to the women's championship.

Ms. Barrett: I am going to invite Donna Noonan to come up. If you take your chart and look at some of these numbers. I am going to ask Donna to give a little perspective as to what went into designing these numbers to fit what we felt was an appropriate model. We certainly welcome any feedback or any additional comment.

Donna J. Noonan (NCAA): From the team championships standpoint, they based that purely on sponsorship numbers within the membership and created a percentage of sponsorship and created the bracket sizes.

They experimented with trying to do a similar thing with the individual team championships and discovered rather quickly that it was very unwieldy, and that some of the numbers would be so great and so large that there would be no way that they could get that taken care of financially. So they took a little bit from the Gender-Equity Task Force, which had come out with a philosophy of creating equal field sizes for men and women.

To speak to the swimming situation, they looked at the difference in the sponsorship and decided with the women having 13 more institutions sponsoring women's swimming, that they did not add the

eight additional men to the swimming championships.

Richard Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): Two points; one related to the automatic qualification process and the other to the regionalization issue.

First, just to echo the point made by Sheila, in collecting the information regarding the automatic qualification application, it really would be helpful to delay the applications for soccer and volleyball slightly so that it does not conflict with the holiday break and the Convention. It is very difficult to track a lot of that information down, even though we do try to track it during the course of the season.

The second has to do with the regionalization process and the emphasis on regional play. There was a comment made this morning in regard to the comparison between regional play and conference play. There are conferences—ours, perhaps, in the most extreme case—where you have members of a conference that are spread over multiple regions. I would hope that emphasis would be given to treating conference play in the same context that regional play is treated, even though it may occur outside of regions.

Conferences compete with other member schools for philosophical reasons and reasons of institutions being of a similar nature and so on; not because they want to go out and play the best schools around the country or outside of their region. That is a very important distinction to be made and sometimes gets lost in the shuffle. Conference play—even though it is outside of a region—is done in the same vein, along the same philosophical lines, as regional play.

James M. Malmquist (Gustavus Adolphus College): Two comments. First, on behalf of the Division III Football Committee, I solicit your input in writing. We meet in February. We are very concerned about the consistent application of criteria. It is an extremely difficult thing to do. We need all the help we can get. This is a big country and there is a tremendous diversity amongst and between the regions. It is a formidable task. We have received a lot of good input. We appreciate any more that we can have before that middle-of-February meeting.

Secondly, representing my own institution, I have a little bit of concern. I am sure the committees are talking about playing tournaments before the national tournament in tennis and golf, where we are almost forced to go on long trips to play significant people who will be involved in national tournaments traditionally so that there is some kind of a pseudo ranking that occurs before the actual process begins.

And if we want to talk about cost containment, St. Peter, Minnesota, is a long ways from Phoenix and Southern California. I think it is something we need to think about.

Ms. Barrett: We have heard from some folks from the football community and have forwarded the materials. We welcome some more, because I think this is very significant. The time frame is very significant. Some people have told me today that they are going to start to write. So I think we will all be hearing from them.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): It would be helpful if individ-

ual and team championships weren't lumped together. They are dissimilar in many ways.

The tennis championship is two distinct championships—one that involves invited teams, another that involves invited individuals. There is no cross-play of results or continuation of those events. I would like to see tennis broken out into the other two charts as far as sports sponsorship and put in the matrix separately. When we get to cross country, it is a mix. Teams are invited, as are individuals, and it is a combined event that is scored on that combined basis. Then we have swimming and indoor and outdoor track where individuals are invited and the team score is simply a combination of everyone's individual efforts that earns points. To treat all five of those as if they were one animal does not do justice to some of the sports. For example, if we are only going to invite 12 tennis teams and we have 80 percent sponsorship of tennis, it does tennis injustice to leave it as it is considered on this chart.

I also would ask that we take off the sports sponsorship form, which takes great time to indicate how many teams we play and how many individuals participate and how many matches we schedule to try to get some kind of totals of how many athletes are participating on our teams and how many athletes are participating in championships. I heard the gentleman from Thomas More talk about what percentage of football players actually have a chance to participate in the championship. Although we don't sponsor football, I would venture if you factor in the squad sizes on a percentage basis, very few Division III football players ever have a chance to participate in the championship versus perhaps a much higher number in sports like indoor or outdoor track. They actually participate, and their chances of participating in a national championship are much higher. So those two things would help me when I look at overall numbers versus a 1-8 or 1-16. It is not that easy anymore. We are looking at it much more in depth. I think that would help.

Ms. Barrett: Have you had the opportunity to share any of your thoughts with the individual sports committees? That would be helpful.

Lynn S. Imergoot [Washington University (Missouri)]: I have a question, a comment and a suggestion.

How did you achieve the numbers in the individual-team championships as they relate to tennis?

My question is: In the 1991-92 statistical summary, there were 137 men who participated according to your results, and 113 women. Is that accurate?

Ms. Noonan: On tennis, from the information we received, the field size for the men was 112.

Ms. Imergoot: But it said 130 men and 113 women participated.

Ms. Noonan: I would have to check on that. I believe two substitutes were allowed to be brought along. They may be included in that number.

I do know in coming up with the 112, that was the field size that they were working with. They added the women to bring them up to what the men's were. We need to double-check what the actual field

size was for the men and be sure that they are comparable.

Ms. Imergoot: For years, I believe the women have had more tennis teams playing tennis than have the men. Last year, assuming this was accurate, it was 280 to 270. Yet, historically the women have been severely under-represented in the sport of Division III tennis.

We have finally worked our way to 12 teams, which is equitable with the men. They have 64 singles. We have 32 singles. They have 32 doubles. We have 16 doubles. It was my understanding that there was not enough ability in women's Division III tennis to warrant any more and that it was also a cost reduction. I would urge if we increase the real numbers—not the numbers people say they are working with—that we come up with a different bracket. If you just increase participants and not increase the brackets, you are going to get inferior players. A suggestion that may seem very way out. Maybe you should consider federation in NCAA championships and women's Division III tennis as a fall championship sport.

Ms. Barrett: We are in touch with the tennis committee. We will get reactions in terms of your suggestions.

Gail H. Davis (Rhode Island College): I was sharing some information with a Division II colleague over lunch and found out something that I was quite surprised at. They seem to have had an influx of between 20 and 25 new members at each Convention into Division II, which was something I would not have speculated on.

I wonder if the championship committee needs to possibly look at how that may alter sports sponsorship within the Association and our ability to save some of those borderline sports to maintain championships, which I think Division III wants very much.

Ms. Barrett: When the Executive Committee and the championships committee last met, part of our discussions were concerned with the fluctuations of numbers and the necessity of staying very close to the sports sponsorship numbers as a sound basis for any future expansion or at least capping any kind of numbers that we were going to work with. The sports sponsorship numbers have assumed a very important role in Division III, especially as Division III's request relates and compares to the requests of Division II and Division I.

Victor A. Clark (Thomas More College): I wanted to address a misperception that I was the cause of. Earlier this morning, I was commenting about the bracketing for Division III football. I hope I did not leave the delegation with the perception that I was being critical of the selection committee.

The selection committee for Division III football has a very difficult job to do and did an outstanding job this year. They selected us, so obviously I am going to think that way. But it was not my intent to be critical of the difficult job that it has. My intent was, as my colleague from Emory has more eloquently articulated, to indicate to the membership that I think that there is a chance to diminish the involvement of Division III football players in postseason play. I want to make sure that it is not because of cost that we make that decision.

I have a perception that it is because football squads are 48 in number. It costs a lot more to send more kids to postseason play. It is difficult for me to hear that when we see hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars being made by the NCAA and reinvested into our membership through drug-awareness programs and those kind of things

My baseball colleague from St. Olaf said that there was a feeling of the American Football Coaches Association that it did not want to extend the weeks. If we extend the tournament by a seven-day period, it involves 96 athletes. To do that, we would include—if we had a 24-team bracket, which is what the bracketing I guess should be—384 more kids for that. If we were to go to a 32-team format, you would include 700-plus kids. The impact about it being too long of a season may with those numbers not be as significant as is brought to the table.

Arthur Eason (Wilham Paterson College): That is a legitimate problem that we do face with the committee. Because as you increase the bracket size—especially in football where you are playing only one day a week—it is going to expand the season. They are already going to December. There are people on the other side who argue that the season is too long, that it should be cut back, rather than extending it. You are talking about extending it another week. Now you are almost to Christmas. That is a major problem. It is coming from one of the sources that has been very critical of that—the Presidents Commission.

Edward G. Coll Jr. (Alfred University): I think you are absolutely right. I think the presidents have that as a concern in Division III, at least the colleagues that I have talked to. They're concerned about the timeliness of the NCAA playoff. That's when these students come back on many of our campuses on the semester system. The first class they attend upon returning is their final examinations. That does cause considerable concern for some of our presidents and some of our faculty. But I think it is such a prestigious occasion that no one expects to have that happen to them more than once or twice in a lifetime. They agree to do these kind of accommodations for these teams.

I was interested in what Vic had alluded to earlier about the possibility of regional championships. I think I and the other Division III presidents would be keenly interested in an in-depth survey and study by the football coaches of regional championships that would give the opportunity to expand rather dramatically the number of teams that could participate and at the same time keep the schedule that we have right now. I don't know if conational champions is the appropriate term for four winners out of something like that. But we certainly would be interested in doing something like that.

Also in response to Vic, there are some financial considerations on our campuses to extending the current season, which would be paramount to the presidents and clearly the faculty. I think the faculty would be totally opposed to that. But it also would mean that if we could not do it at the tail end of the season, we would have to move the schedule back in the fall, which means opening up the campus,

opening up residence halls a week earlier, food service and all the rest. The Presidents simply are not going to do that in the tight constraints they have right now. But if the Association would look at the possibility of regional championships, I think the presidents would like to see what recommendations come out of that to expand teams into these championships, which I think all of the presidents are willing to do if it can be done in a reasonable manner.

Richard Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): Has lobbying of members or chairs of selection committees become a problem on politicizing the process of selection of teams for various championships? Has that been looked at or is that of concern?

Ms. Barrett: That is one of the messages that we were hoping to get across today. The feedback that we receive has encouraged us to look at those types of concerns and to point out and to refine and perhaps change any of the things that we see in terms of inconsistencies. We also have seen as a committee that sometimes the procedures that are being used perhaps vary slightly in terms of emphasis from what folks had thought was being used. We have noticed a couple of them in a couple sports committees. We have been in touch with those committees. Those matters are very seriously being considered. They are a genuine concern to the membership.

Harlan Knosher (Knox College): Apologies to Donna, because I hate to be one of these guys that brings up what is missing from what is actually a very beautiful and very useful chart, which I think all of us are taking very seriously. But there are 120 wonderful kids that have been left off this thing. Golf is not a factor on the chart.

Ms. Noonan: In that chart, we are just trying to demonstrate the changes for the individual teams. So we did not include golf and wrestling. Golf would stay just as they are.

Mr. Knosher: I found myself adding all of this up. I think maybe others have, so it is probably just as well to have it come up, even though I am happy to see there is a perfectly logical explanation. It makes a lot of sense, but I am not sure how many participate in the wrestling meet. One-hundred-twenty male golfers participate, if people are totaling those.

Ms. Noonan: Right, and the committee had that information. That News article was purely to get the word out as to what the changes would be. And I did not take that personally since we know one another from men's golf.

Ms. Barrett: We have heard from quite a number of people. I would like to reiterate once again the work of the committee and thank it for all of the reports and the work through the year. Special thanks to Donna Noonan, whose assistance to the committee is invaluable. I once again ask all of the membership to deal directly with Donna as championship director, me as chair of the committee and the individual sports committees so that every thought or concern is addressed. I talked to some people at lunch. They had some very fine suggestions. A conversation in a corridor is not going to really have as much effect as when you get a letter with something clearly delineated step by step. It is most helpful to your committees. So I would certainly ask that as you are on your plane ride back, perhaps jot

down some of your comments. They are considered and they are forwarded to the appropriate committees. Thank you very much.

Mr. Harvey: One other topic of discussion had been requested for the Convention. It turns out to be in a very appropriate position, considering other discussions that we have had. This is the topic of our membership and, in the broadest aspect, what the growth in our membership means for us in the way of championships and in other areas of concern.

Our membership as we entered this Convention was at 343; the largest of the three divisions. You have all heard about the situation of various other colleges coming to us from the NAIA and so forth.

Dennis Collins is going to introduce that topic, but the idea is for you to be able to contribute to that general discussion concerning Division III membership.

Division III Membership

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): I want to begin this topic with just a reference to what happened yesterday in the general session. We had some very eloquent discussion about the proposal that talked about the fact that each piece of legislation that would be submitted had to be reviewed by an appropriate committee, and that there were certain reviews that were being proposed. Part of that proposal failed. There was some eloquent discussion by Chancellor Forte and Jeff Orleans of the Ivy League. I think in a couple of instances Jeffersonian principles were mentioned.

President Warren from the Presidents Commission was out of the room when the vote was taken. He said: "Well, how did this 51 do?" I said: "Well, it failed. Most of it failed." And he says: "Geez, I am surprised. Why do you think it failed?" And I thought for a minute, and I says: "It must be because the proposal is against Thomas Jefferson and democratic principles."

I think that he went and checked. Sure enough, it was a divided vote, all divisions. And Division III voted most heavily against it. So I think it proves what John talked about just a while ago.

Division III certainly is the division of principles. But I am not so sure if we all have the same principles. I think our discussion this morning on membership really showed that we have all sorts of different ideas about membership. The votes were fairly divided. I guess basically what the steering committee has asked me to talk about is the issue of membership. In the last year, the steering committee has received a number of comments about membership and qualifications for membership and the procedures that have taken place in the past and how we have reacted to membership.

I am going to try to represent those conversations that have come to the steering committee and that have taken place in the steering committee over our last two meetings in particular. This is a topic that is really on the ground floor at this point and really brand new to all of us, as we saw this morning.

So with that preamble, I am going to begin. I will give you some facts first. Division III is the largest division in the NCAA. It has been growing, however, at a faster rate than any other division. Ten years ago, Division III had 287 members. Ten years later, we added

four this morning, so we have 347 members. That is approximately 20 percent or an additional 61 new members in 10 years.

In that same time, Division I has added 20 institutions and Division II has added only 13. The growth of the membership and its impact on Division III and the Association have been a topic of discussion at the steering committee's recent meetings. I think we might be wondering where the applications for membership are coming from. I think there are a couple of areas. But certainly, the No. 1 area has to be current members of the NAIA. I think it has been referenced here that that association is probably losing membership significantly. There was an article in USA Today last October that spoke to that.

In the last several years, not only have we received NAIA members, but our friends in Division II also are receiving many new applications for membership from NAIA schools. This week alone, I believe the Division II group is considering 30 applications from two different conferences from the NAIA. I am not sure what the action was today on those.

What was pointed out in the USA Today article was that from a monetary standpoint, Division III is a good deal compared to NAIA membership. I believe the article said NAIA membership dues are \$3,500 while NCAA dues are \$900. NAIA members pay for their championships while in the NCAA we receive expense-paid championships. I think that is another area that we need to keep our eye on as we look in the future. I think there is going to be a drift from Division I and Division II membership in the Association. As the requirements get tougher to be a member of Division I and Division II, legislatively and financially, since we are in a very difficult financial climate, there may be a migration downward.

I think we have all read that Springfield College has announced that it will go from Division II to Division III. I think that is an example of what may be in store. It is hard to predict the future, but I think we need to look around and see what is happening.

The steering committee has come to no conclusions at this point. This is brand new for us, but we wanted to share with you some of the questions that we are hearing and we are asking. Many of these deal with the future. We ought to consider our growth now so as to plan for it. I think the biggest impact people are telling us is going to be in championships if we have additional new members. The biggest question that they are asking is will the brackets continue to expand. We ask this question in light of the TV revenues for future NCAA basketball contracts. At this point, I think it is all general knowledge—we all read the papers. All TV sport contracts are being reduced dramatically. Both the NFL and Major League Baseball have been asked to take cuts in their current long-range contracts. When the NCAA-CBS contract expires in 1997, will there be increases or will there be deductions? Of course, there is no way to know. But I think we ought to think about the possibility of a reduction. If there are reductions, I believe that maybe all division championships will be frozen or reduced. Hard to tell; but certainly, we ought to think about and maybe plan for that possibility as one of the options that may happen to us.

If I can give you an example. Imagine in men's basketball, where now we have 40 brackets for 347 teams. If our membership would expand each year through 1997 to 420 members—and let's say there would be at that point no expansion of the brackets—that would be an additional 70 teams. We would still have 40 brackets. I don't know how you would feel about that.

Also related to the championship issue is the philosophy of new members as they present their applications to Division III for membership. Do these members embrace the Division III philosophy of a broad-based program or are they focused on a few sports satisfied to meet the minimum requirement of four men's and four women's sports? With the minimum of sports, specialization may be inevitable for some members. This will have impact on a few of our sports. The charts you have show that the high participation sports are men's basketball, women's basketball, women's volleyball and men's soccer. I believe those would probably be the sports that may be impacted the greatest if people have minimum sports. This is the trend of everybody who has basketball, et cetera. So I think that it may have impact on selected sports. We need to think about that possibility.

I think competitively many of our institutions that sponsor 15 to 21 sports, will find it harder to compete against specializing member institutions in Division III that are only sponsoring a few sports compared to them. I think this would possibly create a great diversity in Division III, especially with the difficult economic times, to try to excel on the field and offer your college a broad-based program.

On the other hand, new membership can make our division even stronger. I think the key area would be geography. In areas where we have few Division III members, it would be a helpful to have new members there for scheduling and for Division III conferences. From what I have been told, in the West and South is where this would be of benefit.

I think the second thing is that it is flattering to know people want to be part of us. They must think that we are operating our college athletics programs with the right attitude. That is a compliment to us when they apply for membership.

In conclusion, as I take a look at this new topic—the possible expansion and growing membership in Division III—there may be at least three alternatives to the way we may approach this. No. 1, accept all of those that apply; No. 2, enforce without waiver the current requirements for membership, and No. 3, increase requirements for new members. There may be all sorts of other alternatives. The steering committee wanted members to be aware and to be involved in this important new issue. We have asked that the NCAA Review and Planning Committee study the impact of new members on Division III. They have accepted that project.

We want your ideas on this, whether it is today or when you go home and have had a chance to think about what has happened here. Please contact any member of the steering committee and give us your ideas. Obviously, there are a lot of ideas out there. It is a new topic. We need to know how to deal with it.

Mr. Harvey: There are some real good thoughts there. As we have

seen, this is a sensitive topic. It is one we need to consider and face.

In my opinion, Division III shows the benefits of diversity. For example, new members can be a boon to our championships and to our other activities. We do know about the geographical difficulties we have in the West and Southwest where Division III members are so widely spread that it is much more difficult for them than it is for colleges in New England. I see our Colorado College representative shaking his head yes. This is a real problem in that area.

So obviously, there are some good advantages to new members. But there also are some difficulties in how we do this and what effect it has.

Richard Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): I have a question that relates to a proposal that comes before the general business session and relates to this topic. That is Proposal No. 151, which is a resolution of federation by sport.

In speaking with the sponsors of that legislation, it appears that they are talking in terms of federation by sport within Division I. When we have talked about it within our conference meetings and with others, there seems to be some confusion as to just what that whole concept is all about. Is that something that they are studying within Division I or does that become an issue where the federation by sport crosses divisional lines and then begins to bring us back to a situation of multidivisional classification or other issues that would affect us?

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): It is my understanding that there is some sentiment for not supporting the resolution that is before you, not because there may not be merit in exploring whether there should be some federation. But because the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics is looking at a creative approach primarily for Divisions I and II.

They are not at this point talking about doing anything to change the philosophy or the structure of Division III. Apparently, there is some interest at the Divisions I and II level to looking at whether there should be some cross-over.

Mr. Harvey: The Recruiting Committee also is looking into that same issue about the sport-by-sport differences.

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: Dennis, what do you attribute the growth in Division III to? Why is it expanding so quickly? Is it because of the prestige of the NCAA or is it because of the paid championships?

Mr. Collins: I don't know that I have the answer to that. I would guess that the cost of doing business may be attractive to some people. I think people really do think Division III makes a lot of sense. We are chugging through this tough economic time. It is making more and more sense to people, especially for smaller institutions that have tried to be Division II. I think reality may be crashing down on them, and Division III looks pretty good. I just don't know. That is about all I could guess.

Mr. Schael: You had mentioned one thing about not approving waivers. You were giving some consideration to that. You had to

meet the membership criteria in order to be accepted into Division III. There are a lot of positive merits to that. If money is a factor in terms of the proliferation and growth of Division III athletics, maybe new member institutions would have to have a vested interest within the Association, perhaps a period of five years after they are in full compliance before they are able to receive any financial reimbursement for participation in championships.

Mr. Collins: That is an idea. Make a note of that, John, and put it on the docket. We all have a vested interest, certainly the current members, in our championships. That is what I think the steering committee keeps hearing. We are members. We have been members for a long time. We would like to appear in the championships.

Robert C. King (Millsaps College): I think the other financial aspect to look at with the CBS contract is the catastrophic insurance policy being provided for us. I am not sure in the NAIA, if that is being done.

Mr. Harvey: That definitely has been an advantage for us. I am sure we have appreciated the savings we have accrued there.

James Dimick (St. Olaf College): I just wanted a clarification from my football-coaching friend from Thomas More. I think that there was a misunderstanding. When I came from Atlanta last week, the football coaches who I talked to overwhelmingly said that they would gladly extend the season for a week. They felt that the number of teams that were in postseason play in football was far below the percentages of other sports. I want to go on record as supporting more football teams in postseason play. I think there was a misunderstanding there.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): Listening to some of the comments piqued my interest. I happened to be fortunate enough to be part of the Council that originally drafted the Division III philosophical statement. I wonder if we are trying to maintain the membership at a particular level without swelling to greater and greater numbers. Outside of checking to find out how many basketball games they play and whether they are in compliance with certain kinds of other criteria, maybe it is time that we begin to do a better job of screening whether people are indeed living by that philosophy.

It might not be enough just to come to the door and say we are a four-year school, we sponsor six men's and six women's sports, and we play this kind of a schedule. But do they conduct their program so it fits the philosophy of Division III? I don't know how you do that, but maybe that needs to be looked at. Maybe there needs to be a closer screening, not just come to the door and rap and say, "Okay. It is automatic. You come in." Maybe there has to be some other way to evaluate the quality of a program.

Mr. Harvey: That is one of the options that Dennis mentioned. One of the logical options in the question is the one you mentioned. As you say, when it is a philosophical consideration, it is very difficult not only to establish standards, it is almost like the question of defining gender equity. It is a very difficult philosophical standard to set, to define and to hold up to those institutions. Nevertheless, if we

are saying that philosophy and principles are that important in Division III, then perhaps your suggestion is something we should look at. I believe that is the gist of your point.

Gordon Collins (College of Wooster): In response to the query about what is happening with increased interest in Division III, I am on leave this year from the College of Wooster and working at the University of Kansas. As many of you know, that corner of Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska is a hotbed of NAIA private liberal arts colleges, some of them church-related. Most of them church-related.

You also know that the NAIA has moved its headquarters this year from Kansas City to Tulsa. With it, they are also taking the NAIA basketball tournament. I think that is going to be a contributor to a number of those colleges, along with the prestige of being in the NCAA. There is no question that those private colleges in Kansas and Missouri and Nebraska and Iowa believe the NCAA has a far more prestigious collection of private colleges like themselves and that they would like to align themselves with us. I think that move of that national organization to Tulsa will further interest in that group of colleges in becoming NCAA Division III members.

Mr. Harvey: I have felt that Division III and our steering committee and the various committees that we have sometimes neglect long-range strategic planning on this and other topics. It is interesting that in each of our steering committee agendas, I always list long-range planning. For some reason, we put it at the end of the agenda and very infrequently get to it. Yet, as indicated by our discussions, you will see that perhaps this is a considerably more important topic in guiding our future long-range directions than very specific things that we also talk about.

We have to handle our business in the various management techniques in a specific way, but we do need more long-range planning and creative ideas such as Bill mentioned and the many others that could be part of the picture.

Are there other topics that you think would be of interest for this open discussion?

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I would like to refer back to an item we voted on yesterday, Proposal No. 58. It was a Presidents Commission issue regarding a resolution for student-athlete welfare, access and equity.

It refers to a study. The last time we did this, we did a study on time management and commitment of athletes. We had a great deal of legislation that came down that affected us. We were not part of the study. I would like to make sure this time that the steering committee ask that we either be part of the survey or we not suffer the consequences of some Division I survey that generates mass legislation and hysteria at our level when we are never asked a question.

Mr. Harvey: That is a great point, something we have regarded. On some occasions we feel we are somewhat underestimated or perhaps under-regarded. We are trying to continually keep ourselves in the picture and be somewhat more proactive rather than the division that is in the closet or operating unobtrusively. We want to be in the front of consideration and have our points considered throughout.

Linda S. Moulton [Clark University (Massachusetts)]: Chuck, whether it is any consolation, I will be serving on that committee. I will assure you that I will make sure that that concern is addressed to the committee. It has not met yet. I assume that that is why there will be Division III representation.

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Harvey: We have been able to secure Division III representation on a number of committees. I believe we are advancing in the proper direction there.

I have a couple other items. A few statistics of interest. They at least interested me and one other person I talked to, so I am going to mention it here.

The percentage of our total membership in Division III that has been voting in the general session and this one has been of interest to me to see how many of our members are here and voting. We have been approximating in the general session at 76 to 77 percent of our total 343 membership voting actively in those sessions. In this session and our earlier session, we have been voting between 70 and 75 percent on most issues. To me, that is good. I really don't know how it compares with previous years. But I think for Division III to vote at that rate is good representation. It obviously could be better, but I was encouraged by that.

I also would like to say something about our voting system. I know that in the last year or two it has been a little bit of a question about how long it takes to record these votes. I don't think it is a problem any more in our electronic voting. We have been averaging around one minute and 20 seconds per vote to get back to us after we have taken the vote or shut the polls. I think that is a great system. In the general session, it has been running at about two minutes and 45 seconds on the average. But even that is a great improvement over what we had done previously.

I have two other comments. I do want to thank the people who have been working with our electronic voting system. They have done a great job. I want to thank Donna Noonan for her contribution to the championships discussion and to Dan Dutcher. Once I overcame the fact that he graduated from Notre Dame, he has done just a great job for us. He has really been a great ally to the steering committee and has provided us with a lot of material and done just a great deal of work. So I want to thank him personally. I think we owe him gratitude. I would like to thank our steering committee. You may seldom realize how much time the steering committee puts into consideration of all the materials we receive and all the preparations we have. They have done a great job.

And finally, I believe Rocky Carzo has an announcement. Having worked under him and with him for a couple years, I am sure you would want to hear what he has to say.

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): Graceful, profound advice, John. Thank you. I don't think that we want to close this session of the Convention without all of us joining together and recognizing the untiring efforts, the complete dedication and the magnificent manner in which our president has worked for us, with us and in a man-

ner, I think, that respected everything that all divisions stood for and particularly reflected so well on herself, her school, Division III, the NCAA and really brought a lot of class and dignity and recognition of Division III. Judy Sweet is a remarkable woman who did a magnificent job. [Applause.]

Mr. Harvey: Thank you, Judy, from every one of us.

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.]

Division I Business Session

Thursday Morning, January 14, 1993

The Division I business session was called to order at 8 a.m. by R. Elaine Dreidame, NCAA Division I vice-president.

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Dreidame: The Division I business session now is convened. Our parliamentarian this morning is Alan Chapman, a name that is familiar to anyone who has attended an NCAA Convention during the past 19 years. Our task today is to complete the Presidential Day portion of the agenda for the Division I business session.

[Note: The procedure for voting was explained.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

NCAA Athletics Certification Program

Joseph N. Crowley (University of Nevada, Reno): On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): I move Proposal 15-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 15-1 represents a minor change in the certification proposal to provide more flexibility for the committee and the Council in selecting a chair for the proposed NCAA Committee on Athletics Certification.

As it stands, the current proposal provides for a chair-elect who will serve for two years at which time that individual will resume the chair position for another two years. This means that in order to allow for the complete terms as chair-elect, and then chair, the individual will be selected after serving perhaps only a year or two on the committee. It also means that other committee members with greater tenure on the committee will not be in a position to be nominated for the chair even though they have gained experience through years of committee service. Council members have pointed out that if the committee wishes to establish some informal arrangement by which one or more committee members become more familiar with and even share in some of the duties of the chair, it certainly can do so.

For those reasons, the special committee and the Council have sponsored this proposal, which would delete the chair-elect provision. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 15-1 (Page A-29) was approved by Division I, 289-14, two abstentions, roll-call vote.]

William M. Sangster (Georgia Institute of Technology): On behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission, I move adoption of Proposal No. 15-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposed amendment-to-amendment seeks to clarify the spoke in the certification program with regard to minority issues and the section of the operating principles affecting proposed Bylaw 23.2.4.2, which is related to the institution's commitment to equity.

Some concerns were expressed this fall in the language presented by the Special Committee on Athletics Certification for proposed Bylaw 23.2.4.2. The concern was that the reference to "full faculty and staff" in the paragraph on minority issues extended the program beyond the field of athletics to a field of policies regarding staff and faculty in general. This was not the special committee's intentions and this proposed amendment-to-the-amendment clarifies the committee's intent that the operating principle related to equity in minority issues only encompasses students and personnel associated with the athletics program.

The Council and Presidents Commission support this amendment. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 15-2 (Page A-30) was approved by Division I, 302-6, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

John Thornton (University of North Texas): I move Proposal No. 15-3.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment is intended to strengthen, not weaken, Proposal No. 15. Our intention was that the people who we suggested—the financial aid administrators, registrars, admissions officials and chief financial officers on our respective campuses—will be charged with a large part of the duty that is set forth in Proposal 15.

We feel that these people should be represented on the committee for oversight purposes and that they are the ones who should be on it.

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): The Council and the Presidents Commission oppose this proposal. On behalf of those groups, let me make it clear that they are by no means opposed to financial aid administrators, registrars, admissions officials or financial aid officers serving as members of the committee.

In fact, in its pre-Convention meeting, the Council specifically endorsed a recent interpretation of the Interpretations Committee that the proposed Special Committee on Athletic Certification must include at least one of the four primary athletics administrators. This is not in the original proposal. The remaining eight committee positions may be filled by individuals with other responsibilities, including those that are listed in Proposal No. 15-3. The Council and the Commission's opposition is based, however, on an interest in maintaining the greatest flexibility possible in the membership of the committee.

In formulating the certification proposal, the special committee took care to avoid to the greatest extent possible earmarking the committee's position for any particular constituent group. The special committee felt that the anticipated heavy demands that we place on committee members argued strongly for considerable latitude in the committee's membership. This approach will allow the Council

and the Administrative Committee to appoint committee members who fairly represent the Association's diverse membership, but who also have the necessary expertise and who can devote the time necessary to effectively accomplish the committee's work. On behalf of the Council and the Commission, I urge your opposition to this proposal.

[Proposal No. 15-3 (Page A-30) was defeated by Division I, 74-242, four abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Joseph N. Crowley (University of Nevada, Reno): Speaking to the main motion, the actions at this Convention regarding the certification proposal will bring to some resolution a process that began some three years ago. This concept was discussed initially by Executive Director Dick Schultz and a small committee of the Council in 1989.

Since then, as the legislation has been developed through many drafts, it has gained the support of not only the full Council but as well as the Presidents Commission, which has made it a centerpiece of our agenda for this Convention. It also has the support, as the delegates I am sure know, of the Knight Foundation Commission, which has urged approval of certification as a primary element of the three-and-one prescription for increased presidential authority in intercollegiate athletics.

This certification program has come a long way since the voluntary pilot program was launched with the help of 35 Division I institutions more than two years ago. My own institution was one of those pilot-program institutions. I know the kind of burden that was imposed by the pilot project on the institutions that volunteered to participate in that project. It was a considerable burden. It involved a considerable expense, both direct and indirect.

However, that project purposely was designed to be expansive and taxing in order to allow the Special Committee on Athletics Certification, which I had the privilege of chairing for the last 18 months, to provide a solid and substantial base of information in order to pare down the certification concept to its most meaningful and effective component. From the outset, this committee has labored under the residue of impressions and memories left by the pilot program and by the burden that that program imposed. So I feel it is important to emphasize something at this point—the proposal that is before this Convention is much similar, much less onerous and much less expensive than the pilot project.

This proposal bears the mark of the membership of our Association. It is a product that is devised by hundreds of individuals, institutions, conferences and constituent units of this Association as well as public hearings, presentations to the Council, Presidents Commission, Knight Commission, major national higher education associations and committees invited to comment on the many drafts of the legislation published or circulated through these many months. The advice that we received on the program resulted in a number of changes from the pilot project. The program has been reduced in scope from seven topic areas of support. For example, there now is a reduction in the number of self-study questions from the more than

200 that were involved in the pilot project to fewer than 40 in the proposal before you. This proposal also has greater flexibility for conference involvement in the program, based on an increased use of already existing campus records for the self-study report. It has resulted in cooperation and collaboration with the regional accrediting agencies in order to eliminate duplication and overlap. And if an institution prefers, this proposal will allow it to align its schedules for NCAA certification and the regional accreditation.

I believe that these suggestions have enhanced an already sound concept. That concept is that broad campus involvement, which is the feature of this proposal, in institutional self-study that is reviewed by respected peers nationwide can combine to improve the quality of intercollegiate athletics.

That is the fundamental proposition before you—self-study, broad campus involvement, peer review and improvement of intercollegiate athletics. I urge your support for Proposal No. 15.

Carl F. Ullrich (Patriot League): The Patriot League has submitted amendment-to-amendment No. 15-4. It specifies that after the first five-year certification that the interval between subsequent certifications be 10 years. You can imagine from our lack of presentation why we withdrew this amendment-to-the-amendment.

It is important to us that the membership know that we withdrew the amendment because we felt that it was a distraction from the important philosophy and goals of the legislation as it now stands. We have some real concerns regarding cost, staff time, the coordination of this certification and the other requirements. We are certain that others in this membership share these concerns. We believe that after the basic certification legislation is in place, it will be possible for us to make adjustments and fine-tune it after the first cycle is complete. We urge the membership's adoption of this landmark legislation that will indicate to the public our commitment and determination to all that truly makes athletics a vital and integral part of the educational process.

[Proposal No. 15-4 (Page A-31) was withdrawn.]

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): As chair of the Presidents Commission and on behalf of the Commission, I rise to encourage your support of Proposal No. 15. President Crowley touched on the lengths the committee went to in seeking suggestions for this athletics certification process. It solicited input from a wide variety of individuals and groups in this Association. The committee has made changes in this program based on those suggestions.

The Commission was among those in the past year and one-half who raised questions regarding certification, particularly related to the program's scope, its complexity and its relationship to divisional accreditation. We have watched the program closely and we are satisfied that this simplified version represented by the committee is a workable and effective means to accomplish this important task—educating the institution, the community and public on the good work being done in intercollegiate athletics, with the promise that will demonstrate this Association's fulfillment to solving problems.

Like many of you, I have attended meetings of major higher educa-

tion associations. I know that the certification concept has the full support of these associations. Dr. Peter McGraw, a consultant who attended this Convention, supports certification. We also are aware of the importance that the Knight Commission has subscribed to this effort. I want to say that Dr. Wright, the president of the Knight Foundation, gives his all. We must assure that the doors of intercollegiate athletics swing open to the full university and community and to the public at large. They must have confidence in the integrity of our enterprise.

The commitment of time and resources to the certification process is not inconsequential. It is a serious look at a visible and substantial part of the institution's operation. It is not overwhelming by any means. President Crowley suggested that the self-study process, as currently configured, will not be dissimilar to the appointment of a significant committee on our college campuses. A typical self-study report probably would be less than 50 pages.

Besides these indirect costs, the direct costs to the institution fundamentally will be that of bringing five peer reviewers to the campus, which might be expected to be in the range of \$5,000 to \$10,000. This does not seem to the Commission to be too great of an investment to help ensure presidential authority and institutional and public confidence in our athletics programs. It is a wise investment.

We ask you to please join with the Commission and the Council in the support of this proposal. Thank you.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I was sorry to see my friend from the Patriot League decline to submit his amendment. I will respect his wishes that it will not be submitted. I must say this organization does have the tendency to overkill.

If certification is something that we are going to move toward, I think that it can be a valuable experience if done properly and prudently. I am not of the opinion that the frequency with which it is being proposed to be done is a good idea. That gives me some cause for concern.

We in education are involved in accreditation very, very frequently. It is getting closer to the point where you sometime spend all your time being accredited and reaccredited. I really wonder if it is necessary to do this with the frequency that we are proposing.

Joseph N. Crowley (University of Nevada-Reno): I understand the issue the gentleman from Appalachian State has put before us and that was proposed in Amendment No. 4 to this proposal.

It is a subject that the Special Committee on Athletics Certification as well as the Council and the Commission addressed on a number of occasions and decided that while there were some very good arguments on the side of the 10-year cycle there also were some good arguments on the side of the five-year cycle. That is where we started. Ultimately, it seemed to the committee as well as I believe to the members of the Council and the Commission that it would be best to leave this judgment to the committee on certification to establish the standing committee as a consequence of the passage of this legislation.

I might note that one of the interpretations that the delegates

have of Proposal No. 15 notes that the duties of the Special Committee on Athletics Certification include reviewing and recommending changes in the certification cycle if appropriate. We thought that being sensitive to the concern just raised and encompassed by Amendment No. 4 to Proposal No. 15, that it was appropriate to note that this matter will be discussed on the basis of experience rather than persuasive argument as the certification program is implemented.

George C. Young (University of North Texas): Before we begin voting on the Presidents Commission legislation, will you please rule on the interpretation that we received since coming to the Convention? We asked the question of Proposal No. 51, which states in part that legislation designated by the Presidents Commission could not be amended for a two-year period.

We want to know if this protection of the Presidents Commission legislation includes the Presidents Commission legislation being considered at this Convention. The answer we received was yes.

So in plain English, if Proposal 51 and Proposal 15 passed, would the membership be allowed to amend Proposal 15 at next year's Convention or is it protected by Proposal 51 and the two-year amendment limitation?

Ms. Dreidame: The answer I am advised is no. You could amend 15, because 51 would not apply to this year.

[Parts A through H of Proposal No. 15 (Page A-13) as amended by 15-1 and 15-2 were approved by Division I, 274-41, four abstentions. Part I was approved by Division I, 311-10, two abstentions. Part J was approved by Division I 310-11, one abstention, roll-call votes.]

Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will establish a clearinghouse to certify the initial eligibility of prospective student-athletes in Divisions I and II. It is the result of a thorough study by a special Council subcommittee.

Although the subcommittee's review of this issue began in the fall of 1991, this topic is not new. It has been studied in the past by the Academic Requirements Committee and has been the subject of prior Convention resolutions. This proposal has received a significant amount of pre-Convention discussion. On December 31, a five-page memorandum describing it in detail was mailed to each Division I and Division II chief executive officer, director of athletics, faculty athletics representative, senior woman administrator and conference commissioner. In addition, an article regarding the proposed clearinghouse appeared on Page 1 of the pre-Convention issue of The NCAA News.

Each Division I and Division II institution currently certifies the initial eligibility of prospective student-athletes, walk-ons and recruits. This process dictates a significant amount of work by testing agencies, high school counselors and campus administrators. The subcommittee is confident that the proposed clearinghouse will bene-

fit the membership and high-school student-athletes by eliminating this duplication. This process also will provide a level playing field because there will only be one analysis of each high school 48-H form and there only will be one certification decision for each prospective student-athlete.

Therefore, information relative to initial eligibility will be more credible and will be available on a more equitable basis. In addition, the clearinghouse will remove the burden and expense of certifying initial eligibility of prospective student-athletes from institutions. It is estimated that the annual cost of certification of initial eligibility for each prospective student-athlete will be approximately \$23. The financing of the clearinghouse will be shared by the prospective student-athlete and the NCAA. The cost to each prospective student-athlete will be approximately \$15 to \$18. Needy prospective student-athletes can obtain a waiver of the clearinghouse fee in a manner similar to that used to request a waiver for the ACT or the SAT examination. The annual cost to the NCAA will be approximately \$500,000 for all prospective student-athletes. This includes all 500 Division I and Division II institutions. This equates to approximately \$1,000 for each Division I and Division II institution.

Timeliness will be emphasized. The clearinghouse will provide each prospective student-athlete and each member institution with the preliminary and final certification information in a simplified and equitable manner. Notification and communication from the clearinghouse will either be by postal service, facsimile or mailgram. Immediate access to eligibility information will be available to the clearinghouse database inquiry system. This system will be linked to an automated voice response system. Institutions will have access to the clearinghouse database inquiry system by entering a password that will be issued by the clearinghouse to authorized officials. They also will have to enter one or more student identification number.

Prospects and their parents also will have limited access to this system. Once all eligibility information has been obtained by the clearinghouse, it then will be possible to render an eligibility decision within about 60 minutes. In addition, the clearinghouse will issue a written copy of the student's eligibility status within 48 hours. The effective date of Proposal No. 17 is August 1, 1994. The clearinghouse operations will affect the certification of prospective student-athletes who are members of the 1993-94 recruiting class and thereafter. Accordingly, the clearinghouse operations will begin to come on line during late summer of 1993.

I would like to clarify one issue relating to Part A of the proposal, which refers to Division I. Since the clearinghouse will be operational in the fall of 1993, institutions will have the option of utilizing the clearinghouse for certifying eligibility of prospective student-athletes for official visits per Bylaw 13.7.1.2.4. This service will not be mandatory until the fall of 1994.

In closing, the adoption of this proposal will bring the certification of initial eligibility into the 21st century. We urge you to vote yes on Proposal No. 17.

Frederick W. Obear (University of Tennessee, Chattanooga): On

behalf of the Presidents Commission, I wish to encourage the delegates to adopt this proposal. The establishment of an initial-eligibility clearinghouse will greatly enhance the academic integrity of the Association's initial-eligibility process.

It also will help institutions save money by freeing up campus administrators who currently are responsible for determining the initial eligibility of student-athletes. Finally, the clearinghouse will create an invaluable database that the Association can better use to evaluate its initial-eligibility legislation for future consideration by the Convention. I ask for a "yes" vote on this proposal.

Arthur W. Cooper (North Carolina State University): I may have missed in the material provided on this proposal an answer to the question I am going to raise. If so, I apologize.

It is not entirely clear to me what would happen if it were determined that a year after the student was certified there was some error in the certification and the student therefore was held ineligible instead of eligible.

It is not clear whether or not there would be any penalty on the institution that placed the student or not. Has that question been considered?

Mr. Banks: The philosophy, as discussed by the subcommittee with regard to a situation like that, was that the institution would be held harmless.

[Part A of Proposal 17 (Page A-32) was approved by Division I, 290-30, three abstentions. Parts B and C were approved by Division I, 291-18, three abstentions, roll-call votes.]

Initial Eligibility—Core-Curriculum Requirements

William B. DeLauder (Delaware State College): I move adoption of Proposal No. 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 19 seeks to strengthen the minimum core-curriculum requirements for initial eligibility by increasing the English requirement from three courses to four and by specifying that math courses must include Algebra I and geometry.

We know the courses high-school students should take in order to be prepared for success in college. We know the courses that a high-school student should take in order to be able to score at a reasonable level on the SAT or the ACT. But in my opinion, we have not prescribed a core curriculum that reflects our knowledge of what a minimal college preparatory curriculum should include. I have been one to speak out about the manner in which this body has used SAT and ACT scores as a part of the initial-eligibility criteria. I will have fewer reservations about this if we at least require that students complete the courses that will prepare them for the SAT or the ACT. On the one hand, I believe that it is morally wrong to set minimum SAT and ACT scores and on the other hand not specify the key courses needed to meet those expectations.

I know that students who have not completed geometry will not be able to score high on the math SAT because they will not have been exposed to much of the math needed to answer many of the questions. We know from the college boards 1992 profile of SAT takers

that students who have completed four years of English score on the average 37 points higher on the SAT verbal and 38 points higher on the SAT math than do students who complete three or three and one-half courses in English.

For many student-athletes, this change will have no effect because most will take a college-preparatory curriculum that far exceeds the minimum specified by the NCAA. It will have its greatest impact on minority and low-income students who are subject to low expectations on the part of teachers and counselors and results in many students not completing a strong college-preparatory curriculum. These proposed requirements are very minimal but they will at least provide better guidance than is now provided and will be more honest in telling prospective students what it takes to be successful in college. This proposal is based on sound research.

First, the profile data published by the college boards supports this proposal. I have already discussed this key data in justifying the proposed changes. Secondly, the College Board Study titled "Changing the Odd Factors Increasing Access to College," clearly demonstrates that geometry is a grade-keeping course for all students. That is to say that students who completed a course in geometry were more likely to complete college than those who did not. For minorities, especially African-Americans and Hispanics, the differential in graduation rates disappear between whites versus minorities among students who completed geometry.

No other course or combination of courses had this profound and unique effect. This provides a compelling reason for requiring all students to complete a course in geometry as one of the required math courses. The study shows that five percent of the students who had less than one year of geometry obtain a bachelor's degree or senior status within four years, as compared to 29 percent of the students who completed a year of geometry. The odds of a black student obtaining a bachelor's degree or senior status without at least a year of geometry on the basis of study are 1 in 40. For Hispanic students, the odds are less than 1 in 60. These clearly are compelling results.

Third, a recent ACT report clearly indicated that a major cause of student failure in college is that too many students do not complete the high-school courses needed for success. The NCAA should not contribute to these failures. We must be honest with students. We must not contribute to their chances of failure by providing weak curriculum advice.

Fourth, we review any SAT or ACT guide and note the math review section. All guides I have reviewed highlight the importance of geometry as one of the math courses needed to be able to answer many of the math questions. I am disappointed that the Presidents Commission has opposed this proposal. The stated reason for the Commission's opposition, as I understand it, is that the proposal is not recommended by the Academic Requirements Committee. I believe part of the reason for opposition is based on several misperceptions about this proposal. I would like to briefly address a few of these.

First, this amendment will not delay the implementation of 1992

legislation. That legislation is effective August 1995. This legislation is effective August 1996. There are some who say that this proposal is too prescriptive for math and that it is intended to be prescriptive for the minimum requirements. It must be prescriptive if we expect students to take real math courses and not courses that do not prepare them for college. This legislation will not limit the math courses of students. Most students will take more than two math courses; and if they do, geometry will certainly be one of those courses. Math is a progressive subject and geometry is one of the essential foundations for students who study math higher than algebra and geometry. This clearly is substantiated by the fact that the 1992 profile of SAT-takers shows that 93 percent of the students completed the course in geometry.

Finally, there are some who argue that we should give the current legislation an opportunity to be tested before we make any additional changes. It is ironic to me that these same critics rejected this same argument when some of us suggested that Proposition 48 should have a chance to work before any changes were made. Despite this, Proposal No. 42 was passed in 1989 and Proposals Nos. 14 and 16 were passed in 1992. Why is it okay to make changes in those cases, but not in this case? I know of no sound academic reasons for opposing this amendment.

We have talked a lot at these Conventions about leveling the playing field. This is an opportunity to level the academic playing field by ensuring that all prospective student-athletes are properly guided in their high-school curriculum.

This is an opportunity to guide prospective student-athletes toward success in college rather than failure. I urge your support of this proposal. In my opinion, it is the right thing to do.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I endorse with enthusiasm the commentary just submitted by my friendly colleague, Dr. DeLauder. I think that it is important for us to articulate within the mystique of our minds the historical context that we must put this legislative proposal.

Less than a decade ago, some of us spoke in opposition to Proposition 48. At that time, those who took exception to that opposition suggested that opponents of No. 48 were doing so at the risk of watering down the curriculum. I find it paradoxical when we seek to take the opposite attack as opposed to that of those who accuse us of watering down the curriculum. Additionally, we are certainly told by reality that the Presidents Commission suggested that this legislation is not appropriate at this time.

The research promulgated by Dr. DeLauder indicates that now is the proper time, particularly in light of the fact that we are talking about a once and for all opportunity to find a model process whereby we have a chance to raise the SAT potential before a young person enters the arena.

I suggest that we rethink the position taken by the Presidents Commission and have a chance to make this work. We are urging in the strongest terms possible that you render a vote of support for No. 19.

The final comment is this. We need to take a look at finding a way for discussions to exist on the floor of the Presidential Forum before particular votes are changed so chancellors and presidents who feel that the posture taken by the Commission is inadequate or incorrect can lobby.

That was not the case this morning or yesterday at the forum. Notwithstanding the fact that a number of CEOs were present who had questions about the precise reasons why, political or otherwise, the decision by the Presidential Forum was one of saying "no" on No. 19.

I suggest and urge in the strongest terms possible, despite the posture of the Commission, that we vote a resounding "yes" on No. 19.

Dale W. Lick (Florida State University): As a mathematician of more than 30 years, what you have just heard is correct. Those students who take algebra and geometry are prepared to do much more both on the SAT and in their academic work.

I think that what we have before us today is a resolution that not only lifts up the standards that we think we should prescribe to but will help our student-athletes. This is a case where we could do both. We can have higher standards and simultaneously set expectations for our students that will help them succeed. That is what we are all about.

I know the Presidents Commission has suggested that we vote against No. 19. I think that this is one of those cases where we need to think it through for ourselves, consider what is best for our students and make that decision today.

What is best for our students is to support higher standards and set an expectation that will allow our students to do well. I urge you to support No. 19.

Jerry L. Kingston (Arizona State University). On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, the Council and the Presidents Commission, I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 19.

There are several features of this particular proposal that I would like to note. The first is that over the last several years the two courses taken in mathematics, at least by some students, have been a pre-algebra course and then a separate second algebra course. The Academic Requirements Committee became very concerned about this. We recommended and the Council approved earlier this year an interpretation of this particular bylaw that said beginning in the fall of 1993, students in high school no longer may take preparatory courses to the first basic course in things like English and mathematics. We already have closed the door for the preparatory courses, so we are certain that the first course that will be taken in mathematics will be the algebra course.

The question that in part this proposal addresses is whether or not we should specify that the second course beyond the basic algebra course must be in geometry. We have heard statistics suggesting that students who have taken the geometry course in high school do better on the SAT. My guess is that students who take calculus also do better. I have not seen and evaluated, and neither has the Academic Requirements Committee, the research results that are being

described this morning. My guess is, and again I have not seen this research, that the source of statistics that we are looking at are comparing the SAT experiences and the college-level experiences of students who have had one course in mathematics—that is algebra—as opposed to students who have had two courses in mathematics—algebra and geometry.

In fact, they are not comparing whether or not geometry as the second course is profoundly better than a course in trigonometry or calculus. If those sources of controlled experiments have been done, then I will have to later perhaps come back and say yes. But my guess this morning is that this research is slowing the effects of taking a second course in mathematics beyond the basic course in algebra and is not simply the geometry course that is preferable to something like calculus.

The Academic Requirements Committee a year ago reviewed and asked the NCAA staff to look at the capability of high schools around the nation to offer the fourth course in English. There are some states in which offering the fourth course in English may be a substantial problem for student-athletes to achieve a four-course requirement in the core.

It is for that reason, when the Academic Requirements Committee a year ago brought to this Convention a proposal to increase the number of core courses from 11 to 13, that we said that two additional courses could be in English, mathematics or natural or physical science.

We believe that that flexibility was sufficient so that high schools throughout the country would allow their people to be able meet the needs of their students so they could qualify at Division I institutions.

Finally, let me make a comment about the research that will measure the effects of the new eligibility legislation that we passed last year. The design of that research, which is now only in its very beginning stages, is set up so that we get measurements two years before the new eligibility standards go into effect. That is 1993 and 1994. Then we'll get measurements for two years on the other side of the implementation of the new eligibility standards in 1995 and 1996. Proposal 19 would introduce a variation in that so that in the final year, 1996, we no longer are looking at the effects of what we passed a year ago, but we would be compounding that with the effects of yet an additional change of 1996 for four years of English and in the change of the mathematic requirements. And if this Association is interested in measuring the effects of these initial-eligibility standards, it is the view of the Academic Requirements Committee that we should leave it alone and have the opportunity to measure the effect of what we have done.

Paul Hardin (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): I came to this Convention pretty well preplanned to support the Presidents Commission in all particulars. I do find persuasive the argument advanced by the mover of this amendment and by Dale Lick, the mathematician.

I come to represent faculty sentiment. We have reviewed all these

proposals with our faculty athletics committee, an elected committee of our faculty. It supported this one strongly.

As to the last argument about the difficulty of getting the four English requirements, we found that in North Carolina, when our system raises academic requirements for admissions to our state universities, it changes the behavior of the local school boards in the proper direction. It improves the performances of prospective students. As much as I respect the sincerity of the Presidents Commission to advance the present rule, I am convinced that to require the course in geometry will be a tremendous advantage to our student-athletes in getting them a good start in the college experience.

I think that since we tend to vote automatically in favor of the Commission, I did feel I should rise and say when there is an amendment that seems to go a little bit farther in the direction of stricter academic requirements, making our student-athletes students, giving them a better side of the college experience, giving them a better preparation for the SAT and representing faculty sentiment at my university, I will support the amendment.

William B. DeLauder (Delaware State College): I want to make three brief comments, particularly in reference to the comments made by the chair of the Academic Requirements Committee.

Certain students who take trigonometry and calculus were not the students we were concerned about here. Obviously those students will take Part C of the math requirement that we expect of the students. I don't see that as an argument against this particular proposal. Secondly, in looking at the profile of the SAT-takers compiled by the college board and in looking at the students in terms of taking four years of English or more, 83 percent of all the students who completed the SAT in 1992 did take four years of English or more. I have mentioned that in mathematics, of all the persons who took the SAT in 1992, 93 percent did take a one-year course in geometry. The last point I wanted to make is that the college board feels so strongly about those issues that it has a major study called "Equity 2000" that is funded by a foundation.

It is geared toward trying to get more minority students interested in going to college and preparing them to be successful. The specific goals are: 1. By the eighth grade all students will be enrolled in preparation for algebra; 2. By the ninth grade, all students will be enrolled in Algebra I, and 3. By the 10th grade, all students will be enrolled in geometry.

The college board feels so strongly about it that there is a major effort across the United States in various school districts to implement this proposal to enhance the access of minorities to higher education.

Robert E. Saltmarsh (Eastern Illinois University): I did write and get a copy of this study and I have some concerns about the language. For example, in the rationale, and I quote: "That is supported by the results of the college-core study that shows the graduation rate of minorities and lower-income students are far greater for students who have completed a course in geometry."

This study certainly does have compelling data to support that. However, and I quote from Page 61 of this study: "College attain-

ment is usually discussed in terms of achievement of a degree." A proper analysis of the high-school class of 1982 requires the students' degree status 10 years or after high school graduation. However such information is not yet available.

The major theme in this study, changing the odds, is the effect of having taken a course in geometry after enrollment within four years after graduation from high school. This simply is language and implications of the study that I think the body should know about.

Freeman Hrabowski (University of Maryland, Baltimore County): I felt compelled to speak because I have taught math for the last 20 years and worked with large numbers of minority students. I can say with confidence that it almost is impossible to do well on the SAT if a student has not had a full year of geometry. I strongly support Proposal 19 and would ask that you reconsider your thinking about this matter if you want to ensure that students are able to do well on the SAT.

Robert Maxson (University of Nevada, Las Vegas): UNLV intends to support this proposal. I agree with my colleague from the University of North Carolina. We always have enthusiastically supported the Presidents Commission. But this appears to be another step to advance academic credibility and academic standards for intercollegiate athletics. UNLV will support this proposal.

Thomas K. Hearn Jr. (Wake Forest University): Speaking for the Commission on this matter, and I may not be very popular, but the fact is that the Commission's record is clear to all that it is in no way reluctant to raise standards nor to push ahead with matters that it thinks are important in the preparation of student-athletes for the academic challenges of higher education. But doing it prematurely with these requirements is in our judgment unwise. Professor Kingston and his committee exhaustively studied this matter. They came forward with the package of recommendations a year ago that we adopted.

Now it seems prudent to that committee, which is comprised primarily of academic experts, to let that process work while this research about which there already is disagreement is evaluated and while we look at the implications of what are complex and important subjects with implications that go far beyond these walls and into the high-school classrooms of the nation. So in our judgment, it will be prudent to go ahead on the presumption at this time without giving the normal process of review time to work.

[Proposal No. 19 (Page A-34) was approved by Division I, 169-145, six abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Distribution of Graduation-Rate Report

James E. Delany (Big Ten Conference): I move Proposal No. 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to point out three facts about Proposal No. 18. We believe that the cost of this proposal will either be borne by the Association or individually by its member institutions.

There is a question about whether or not the Secretary of Education will accept the Association acting for its members under the Federal public disclosure laws on graduation rates. We propose to

empower the NCAA Council to act if this proposal is not acceptable to the Secretary of Education. I know we honored Lamar Alexander. Unfortunately, he will not be in office when this legislation is reviewed. We believe that the Association can act as an agent for its members in fulfilling the law. We propose that the Council have the authority to effect this legislation and that it become necessary.

The most important reason that we support this legislation is because we have thousands of secondary schools and hundreds of junior colleges that will receive information on behalf of hundreds of NCAA members in a single, uniform method of presentation. We believe that it will make communicating with secondary schools and junior colleges much better and clearer. For those reasons, we move Proposal No. 18. I urge its support.

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): As a member of the Division I Steering Committee and the Special Advisory Committee to Review Implementation of 1990 Convention Proposal No. 24, on behalf of the Council, the Executive Committee and the special committee, I urge you to defeat this proposal.

I will give three reasons why we feel that you should do so. The first reason relates to cost. The Executive Committee especially is concerned about this aspect of the proposal. While the cost estimate that appears in the Convention Program is \$151,000, this may actually cost as much as \$450,000 to implement the proposal in 1993. It is true that it will cost the Association approximately \$150,000 to mail the graduation-rate report to each of the nation's 30,000 high schools and two-year colleges. However, in 1993 there will be three editions of the report—the 1992-93 Division I report due out in March, the 1993 Division I report due out in August and the 1993 Divisions II and III report due out in October. It is not clear that these costs equal those that otherwise would have been made by member institutions.

In other words, the Executive Committee and the Council are not convinced this proposal is not a financial wash. Excess funds certainly could be spent on more essential Association services or returned to the membership.

The second reason to vote against this proposal is that it is not necessary. Since the sponsors first submitted this amendment, the Interpretations Committee and the Council have approved an interpretation that greatly reduces the burden associated with the distribution of the graduation-rate summaries to prospective student-athletes. The interpretation now requires that an institution forward the two-page summary only to those recruits and parents who have been contacted in person by the member institution rather than as soon as the recruiting process begins. This interpretation greatly reduces the number of prospects who must receive the graduation-rate summaries and gives an institution more time to accomplish this task. That interpretation also made it possible to include both reports—that to the student and to the parent—in the same envelope so that you don't have to spend postage for two separate mailings. It also provided for inclusion of the two reports to the guidance counselor and coach in the same envelope to further reduce costs.

The third reason for voting against this proposal is most important of all. The NCAA currently is waiting for the Department of Education to issue the final regulations to implement the Student Right-to-Know Act. There will be a waiver of "substantial comparability" as determined by the Department of Education so that institutions will not need to supply graduation rates to both the NCAA and Federal government. Until these Federal regulations take effect, we do not know how much they will relax distribution of graduation-rate reports as described in Proposal 18 or how it will generally affect the waiver process. The Council is seriously concerned that the proposal may well threaten the Association's efforts to obtain substantial comparability. For these reasons, we urge you to defeat this proposal.

[Proposal No. 18 (Page A-33) was approved by Division I, 209-111, two abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Initial Eligibility—Core-Curriculum Requirements

Bonnie Slatton (University of Iowa): On behalf of the Big Ten Conference, I move Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

I simply refer you to the rationale for this motion and also to the discussion that just occurred on Proposal 19. It increases the academic preparation for student-athletes. I simply encourage you to vote yes on this proposal.

Jerry L. Kingston (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I rise to oppose Proposal No. 20. At the 1992 Convention we increased the number of core courses from 11 to 13 and specified that the additional courses must come in the areas of English, mathematics and/or physical sciences.

Proposal No. 20 would allow the two additional core courses to be foreign language courses. I want to make sure that you understand that you can already count two years of foreign language in the 11-course core that we have at the present time. Now that we are increasing the number of core courses from 11 to 13, if Proposal No. 20 passes, it will allow courses that used to be in the other general courses category to cover the two additional core courses that we legislated last year.

So in effect, the addition of the core could end up being courses in nondoctoral religion or courses that I believe and the Academic Requirements Committee believes would be less effective than mandating that the two additional core courses must be in English, mathematics, natural or physical sciences. I urge the delegates to defeat Proposal No. 20.

[Proposal No. 20 (Page A-36) was defeated by Division I, 153-168, two abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Graduate Assistant Coach

E. Roger Sayers (University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa): I move Proposal No. 22.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit an individual in Division I-A football to serve as a graduate assistant coach for a third year if the individual completes 24 semester hours of work during the initial two-year term.

This proposal addresses the fact that a significant number of graduate students who hold the assistantship do not complete their master's degrees within two years for various reasons. A thesis may be required. If so, the degree often requires more than two years to complete.

Sometimes prerequisites need to be taken that extend the study and some degree programs require 36 or more hours. Thus, the proposal simply extends graduate assistant coaches the same opportunities available to graduate assistants in areas unrelated to football or college athletics. I urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 22 (Page A-40) was approved by Division I-A. 87-24, two abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Expenses—Volunteer Coach—Baseball

Ronald J. Maestri (University of New Orleans): I move Proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to refer the discussion to the distinguished baseball coach of the University of Arizona and president of the American Baseball Coaches Association, Mr. Jerry Kindall.

Jerry Kindall (American Baseball Coaches Association): I respectfully request that you approve this proposal. By defeating this we would be hurting the very student-athlete that we serve.

It creates undue hardship on the continuity of teaching and learning. We have situations where a volunteer coach cannot accompany the team in a coaching capacity to away games only a few blocks or miles away. In most instances, having the volunteer coach travel for the entire season would amount to merely a few hundred dollars. The American Baseball Coaches Association feels very strongly about this proposal. Virtually every one of your coaches started coaching baseball in a volunteer or graduate assistant capacity. It is the entry level of college baseball.

In every one of our communities, there are capable and devoted teacher/coaches wanting to serve. By denying them the opportunity to travel, this proposal dilutes not only their effectiveness as teachers but their contributions at little cost to our colleges and universities. Essentially, if the proposal is defeated, it will do that. Please hear us out.

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): On behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 23. At the 1991 Convention, the Division I membership adopted legislation to permit institutions to employ one volunteer coach in sports other than football and basketball with the understanding that such coaches would be restricted to on-campus activities.

The employment of a volunteer coach was recommended because it would result in minimum cost to institutions while providing an avenue for a local individual to remain involved in coaching activities.

The adoption of Proposal No. 23 will result in additional travel and room and board expenses for the volunteer coach to be involved in coaching activities at away games. Such a result is contrary to any cost reduction objective of the Council and the Presidents Commission.

Further, there does not appear to be any strong rationale for al-

lowing a volunteer coach only in the sport of baseball to receive expenses to travel with a team while excluding the volunteer coach from receiving such expenses in all other sports. I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 23.

Glen C. Tuckett (Brigham Young University): I urge your support of this proposal. It involves a small number of institutions and individuals. The people involved truly are volunteers. This proposal is in no way divisive and not intended to circumvent NCAA coaching limitations.

The vast majority of baseball-playing institutions travel by bus. This proposal will enhance the quality of play without noticeably increasing costs. We urge your support of this proposal.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I rise to express its opposition to Proposal Nos. 23, 24, 25 and 26. I hope I can make this statement once. I think that the principles that apply here would apply on each of these. The Council also expresses opposition to these issues.

These proposals—23 through 26—all would have the effect of weakening or rescinding actions that the Association has taken in recent Conventions. We do not want to permit the erosion of the gains that we have made in intercollegiate athletics in higher education. There was a fine-tuning process in place for all of the reform legislation. As it was adopted, there was a review process of all those suggestions. We want the reform legislation to be in effect as it was adopted by this Convention for a sufficient period of time to gain intelligently the effect it is having.

The Commission urges delegates to hold the line and reject Proposals 23 through 26. Many of these proposals individually will sound fine, but if we cumulate several low-cost increases at each Convention with each sport we are moving against the overwhelming pressures of cost containment that we all want. We urge your opposition to Proposals 23 through 26.

[Proposal No. 23 (Page A-42) was defeated by Division I, 84-229, six abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Coaching Limitations—Men's Basketball

C. M. Newton (University of Kentucky): I move Proposal No. 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

Very simply stated, the intent of this proposal is to create institutional flexibility in regard to the position and compensation of the third assistant basketball coach in men's Division I basketball.

A little bit of history and background. As a head basketball coach for 34 years at the college level and a two-time NABC board of directors member, I am really excited about the new direction of the NABC and of the basketball coaches. Basically, the coaches have done what the Presidents Commission, the Council and this Association have asked them to do. That is to work through the system in regard to fine-tuning. The NABC, under the new leadership of Jim Haney, is going this route.

This proposal has been thoroughly discussed since last April. The proposal started with the NABC legislative committee chaired by Coach Mike Krzyzewski of Duke University. It went to the member-

ship, was discussed and approved. In April, it went to the committee on basketball issues meeting in Chicago. It was recommended by that committee. Then it went to the conferences for discussion. This issue paper has been circulated. The coaches' involvement and attention to the legislative process truly is an important change in the NABC. I would hope that all of us would recognize this as an important change and recognize the NABC and coaches' commitment to reform and their part in reform.

Let me briefly state on the uniqueness of Division I basketball. For most Division I universities, basketball, along with Division I-A football, are the primary revenue-producing sports. It is a critical part of funding for all Division I programs. Secondly, it is a unique sport in that the visibility of Division I basketball creates unique pressures and problems for this restricted-earnings position that are not applicable to the restricted-earnings provisions in other sports, other than if you have a restricted-earnings coach in Division I-A football.

Although we realize that the Presidents Commission and President O'Brien have spoken to this, and the NCAA Council has plans for a full study of restricted-earnings categories for next year's Convention, we think this is not in the best interest of the membership. Time is critical. Our feeling is next year would be too late. I'd like to address the misconceptions related to this proposal. The first misconception is that this would add a new full-time basketball coach. This is totally incorrect and inaccurate. It adds no coach. At the current time, we have the third assistant basketball coach. I think all of us realize that is an essential position. The duties, the recruiting restrictions, et cetera, would be the same. The only change would be that this legislation would create institutional flexibility in how the third assistant would be compensated and in what position the coach would occupy—a volunteer, a part-time graduate assistant or full-time. It could be any of those categories.

The second misconception is that this would create a competitive advantage for some. This is not accurate because of the amendments mentioned. Finally, let me address the positives of this legislation.

First, it will eliminate the potential for abuse, the bogus job outside of institutional control and so on. Secondly, it would ensure continued institutional control. One of the great things that the reform has accomplished is this, and we think this is critical.

Thirdly, it would create institutional flexibility that would benefit all of Division I. Fourthly—I think this is important and that we ought to recognize it—it would send great messages to coaches. It seems to me that this body must begin to create credibility. This is needed.

The coaches have worked through the system. The passage of this legislation would show working through the system does have rewards and that the system does work. Finally, it ties in with something that our executive director said yesterday that really caught my attention.

I paraphrase part of his message. Dick Schultz said: "Don't be afraid to backslide if it makes sense." This proposal makes sense. I strongly urge your vote in support of Proposal No. 25.

Charles Cavagnaro (Memphis State University): I rise on behalf of the Council and Presidents Commission to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 25.

First of all, I would like to applaud the new effort of the NABC and to their becoming a part of this organization. The executive director is making great strides.

This proposal is similar to Proposals 23 and 24. It is contrary to the recent reform legislation sponsored by the Council and the Presidents Commission and enacted by the membership in an effort to reduce costs in athletics. Although the adoption will not result in an increase in the number of coaches in Division I basketball, it could increase costs because there is no limit on the amount of compensation that may be provided to the head or assistant coach. In fact, the adoption of this proposal could result in greater institutional spending. The adoption of this proposal will not promote the principle of gender equity in that institutions with greater financial resources may employ more experienced coaches.

Finally, the limitation of the present restrictive-earnings category will probably eliminate institutions from providing opportunities to develop new coaches through graduate-assistant opportunities. I urge the defeat of Proposal No. 25.

Mike Krzyzewski (Duke University): I represent the National Association of Basketball Coaches. As a member of the legislative committee for coaches for the last 15 years and as chair of that committee for the last few years, I want to say for all coaches that we applaud the efforts of the Presidents Commission and all of you in your reform movement.

We would like to think that it is our reform movement and that we are a part of the team because we want to be a part of the movement. We are in favor of it. You have said for the last decade that things would not change in intercollegiate athletics until the presidents would get involved. Now that you are involved, we want to be a part of the process. We want to be in the loop. We want to be able to provide the decision-makers with timely and pertinent information so they will make the best decisions possible.

In regard to this proposal, I would like to bring to your attention the fact that on 1 August '92, the restricted-earnings coach came into being. I had the opportunity of coaching as an assistant coach with the United States Olympic Team this summer—the Dream Team. When I got back from the Olympics in mid-August, I was approached by four boosters in our community. All of them on different occasions in a three-day period extended an invitation for my assistant coach to have a job with them.

In my 13 years as the head coach at Duke University, this has never happened to me in reference to a coach or a student-athlete. I was scared. I don't know if you ever think of coaches being scared, but we are. I approached my athletics director, Tom Butters, about this. We discussed the fact that putting coaches in this position, where we would have to resort to outside employment to ensure a livelihood, would be contrary to the reform movement.

I don't look at the support of this proposal as weakening the re-

form movement. The reform movement would be what you would call a "sterile environment" and all of a sudden you found that there might be a germ that enters into this environment. The germ, not being coaches, is going to cheat and would rather have boosters become a part of the athletics department. It would lead to other things. In eliminating this, I think that you strengthen the reform movement. That is what we are proposing.

We are in support of this because it will strengthen what you already are trying to do. Please take a look at it and allow us to be a part of your team so that we can embrace it as a team. Give us your support in this proposal. We will prove trustworthy in how we handle this so that in the future you will have confidence to rely on timely information from our organization so that we can create an even better climate for intercollegiate athletics.

William E. Kirwan (University of Maryland, College Park): I am against this proposal. At a time when universities across the country are dismissing faculty and students are having trouble getting enough courses to graduate on time, I cannot think of a worse message to send our students, our faculty, trustees and the general public than to pass a proposal that would increase the expenditures of the basketball-coaching staff.

Even if you think that this proposal has merit, which I do not, I ask you to consider the fact that the NCAA Council is studying the position of restricted-earnings coaches for all sports and will make a report on legislation next year. Moreover, next year we will hear a report from the cost-containment committee. So if you support this proposal, I ask you to delay that support until such time as we can at least show the public that there is an overall decrease in expenditures in athletics.

Finally, and for me very compelling, is the fact that if we are serious about gender equity, how can we talk about removing the restricted-earnings coach for men's basketball and not women's basketball?

James Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): The NABC has during the last six months made a very conscientious and concerted effort to try to engage itself into the process of NCAA legislation. Today is really a culmination of those six months. I can assure you that our efforts in the future will be just as determined and hopefully just as helpful. Let me also add that we truly do respect the process and we respect the current movement. As a Division I-A commissioner for four years, I would like to think that I also was a part of the reform movement. The proposal before you is not intended to challenge the Presidents Commission or the Council's efforts.

We respect all those who have been a part of the reform movement. The NABC has surveyed its Division I head basketball coaches during the last few months, and in particular wanted to get some information regarding the restricted-earnings coach position. You will find it interesting. The results of the survey revealed that 73 percent of what we are calling the fourth coach or the restricted-earnings coach held their position for less than three years. Eighty-five percent of those have held it for less than five years.

We conclude that the fourth coach's position truly is an entry-level

position. Before restricted-earnings legislation, we wanted to find out what kind of salaries our fourth coaches were receiving. The results of the survey showed that 60 percent of the fourth coaches earned less than \$12,000. Seventy-nine percent earned less than \$20,000 institutional dollars. When asked after the restricted-earnings legislation took effect how many of those fourth coaches had to actually take a pay cut, 66 percent said they did not. We believe that the pay of the fourth coach is an institutional decision and not one that should be legislated nationally.

We are well aware of the Council's efforts to review the restricted-earnings category across the board. There are a number of our coaches—a small number as indicated by the percentages I presented—who make more than what the cap would suggest that the fourth person should earn. We are concerned about what is going to happen during the next few months as coaches who have been in this fourth position all of a sudden have to take a dramatically reduced salary in light of the fact that at the 1994 Convention they will completely alter how that position is funded.

Proposal 25 permits all institutions to determine salaries of the fourth coach and whatever the appropriate level of salary should be. We strongly encourage you to support Proposition No. 25.

William H. Mobley (Texas A&M University): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge your opposition to Proposal No. 25. As several speakers already mentioned, the Council will be looking at the issue of restricted earnings.

That is a flawed concept that does extend far beyond basketball. That study soon will be underway and the recommendations will be at the forthcoming Convention. I urge your opposition, because of the entrenched and cost-controlled initiatives of this and previous Conventions and the study of the restricted-earnings issue in the broadest context before next year's Convention.

Mr. Krzyzewski: Don't let the misconception evolve that you have to pay somebody in money for this position. What we are looking for is institutional control, which is what the reform movement is all about.

If there are studies going on the restricted-earnings coach for everyone, when potential for the problem exists primarily in one, why would we wait and give a chance for something to happen while we are studying when this legislation puts us in a position to remove the potential for serious, serious problems?

To me, that shows the sign of having great intuition and timely actions. We are trying to stress timely action so that we are not placed in these bad positions.

John P. Crecine (Georgia Institute of Technology): I find Mr. Krzyzewski's logic impeccable. What we have here is a cost-containment movement issue—the restricted-earnings coach—that has negative impacts in other aspects of the reform movement.

It is clear that restricted-earnings coaches generally are considered to be entry-level positions. I worry about the long-term effects of people entering into the coaching profession and becoming used to taking money from outside sources. What happens when these peo-

ple move through the ranks and become head coaches?

It is a bad thing to foster and a bad thing to start. I think that the issue of institutional control is essential.

Bill L. Atchley (University of the Pacific (California)): I support the Presidents Commission. But my biggest concern is if we should have four coaches. I am a little concerned when I see 13 players with four coaches. That is a pretty good player-to-coach ratio.

I see no sense for us to allow additional funds for this when what we really should be looking at is if it is necessary in the beginning.

C. M. Newton (University of Kentucky): As one who has a 30-year career coaching basketball, this sport has changed so dramatically in terms of demands placed on the head basketball coach at the Division I level.

I am not just talking about Division I-A. I am talking about Division I. It boggles my mind that anyone could rise and question whether that fourth coach is needed. I say this for this reason. If you look at it from the standpoint of the demands placed on the head basketball coach and his assistant, the demands of being the public relations expert and fund-raiser, the participation in various alumni activities, and all the other things that are going on with the visibility of this sport, and at the same time the expectation that their players graduate, that they had no discipline problems in the program and that the recruit is a bona fide student. To look at this in a numerical sense makes no sense to me at all.

I think what we really need to look at is that the Division I basketball community is asking for some help because of the uniqueness of the sport.

[Proposal No. 25 (Page A-42) was defeated by Division I, 61-257, five abstentions, roll-call vote.]

[The meeting was recessed at 10:05 and reconvened at 10:20 a.m.]

Maximum Awards—Division I Women's Equivalency Sports

Martha O. Chiscon (Purdue University): I move Proposal No. 27.

[The motion was seconded.]

As the Convention and institutions seriously begin to think about gender equity, I think it is appropriate that we wait for any changes in the number of women's scholarships until appropriate recommendations come from the Gender-Equity Task Force. Therefore, I urge your support for Proposal No. 27.

[Proposal No. 27 (Page A-44) was approved by Division I, 252-50, eight abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Maximum Awards—Division I Women's Basketball

Martha O. Chiscon (Purdue University): I move Proposal No. 28.

[The motion was seconded.]

For the same reasons that I suggested you vote for Proposal No. 27, Proposal No. 28 falls into the same category. We should maintain the number of scholarships for women athletes until there are appropriate recommendations by the Gender-Equity Task Force.

[Proposal No. 28 (Page A-44) was approved by Division I, 221-89, 10 abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Maximum Awards—Division I Men's Basketball

C. M. Newton (University of Kentucky): On behalf of the NCAA

Ad Hoc Committee on Basketball Issues, I move approval of Proposal No. 30.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this legislation is to delay the effective date of the reduction from 14 to 13 the number of scholarships in Division I basketball until the 1995-96 academic year.

Basically, the NABC and the Committee on Basketball Issues are asking for time to study the number of scholarships that will best serve Division I basketball. As you recall, this legislation came about through cost-containment efforts. Ten percent was the number that was arbitrarily decided in terms of the reduction of basketball scholarships, which resulted in a 1.5 reduction. That was rounded off to losing two scholarships. It may be that 13 is the proper number. It may be that 12 is the proper number. It may be that 14 is the proper number. We are not asking for any restoration at this point. All we are asking for is time to study to determine what is the best number for Division I men's basketball.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I rise to urge the delegates to defeat this proposal as well as Proposal Nos. 31 through 36. We are steadfastly opposed to changing the limitations that were adopted in the reform agenda.

As before, I would like to make this statement just one time and not come back again. The sentiment is still the same. The limitations that the membership adopted in the various sports were approved by overwhelming majorities. These proposals would rescind the delay or otherwise weaken the reform movement. Let us not take action that retreats or affects the gains we have been able to make in the last three years. With the cost considerations of our universities, rising costs in these areas will be detrimental to higher education as well as intercollegiate athletics. The Presidents Commission urges the defeat of Proposals 30 through 36 and joins the NCAA Council in their opposition.

James Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): The NABC is very supportive of the action just taken in terms of 15 scholarships for women.

As it relates to the men, two years ago this Convention sought ways of reducing the number of scholarships across the board. A percentage was decided upon. There was no investigative process, but a decision was made to use the figure of 10 percent. As it relates to basketball, I think it commonly is accepted that to prepare properly for a competitive situation in Division I, it requires that there are enough players on the practice floor to work in team situations. With the number of injuries and illnesses and situations where student-athletes leave due to lack of playing time or decide they no longer are going to continue with the program, dropping below 10 players is a real possibility.

In addition, let me say that basketball never has been known as a sport that would run off players. It has been a sport in which our coaches have offered scholarships and have honored them. Even if players did not get playing time, they remained in the program and

had the opportunity to graduate and go on to whatever area of expertise they wanted to pursue later in life. It is a real concern on the part of our board that reducing scholarships from 14 to 13 could force our coaches into making a difficult decision as they try to live in an environment where winning is important. You may not like it that way, but that is the reality. We see it every spring as we look at the number of coaches who are fired or have to resign their positions.

We are not asking for more scholarships. We are not asking to stay at 14. We are asking for a delay to go to 13 so that the study can be performed to make sure that 13 is in fact the right number and will not jeopardize our Division I programs. We respect the Presidents Commission and the reform movement, but in this case no study has been done to address the impact that this reduction will have on college basketball. We urge your support of this proposal.

Ronald G. Schultz (Cleveland State University): We are in Division I-AAA. We just went through the very painful experience of reducing the number of sports that we sponsor so we can offer the same opportunities to women as we can to men.

Now we have just passed two proposals that are going to allow the women's sports to have equivalencies where they were scheduled to be. I think from our standpoint we must do the same thing and delay the reduction in basketball because otherwise you are going to be way out of kilter in terms of more women than men.

This has been very, very painful for us. We have worked very hard to come into the position of offering the same number of opportunities for women as men. I am very supportive of this amendment.

James H. Maxey (Georgia State University): I urge the delegates to vote against Proposal No. 30. My rationale is that since we didn't pass No. 25, we obviously don't have enough coaches to deal with 14 players.

Mike Krzyzewski (Duke University): This is my first Convention. This probably is not the time to talk about misconceptions. But the gap between the people in the field and the people in administration is a wide one as far as the understanding of just what we are doing.

We consider ourselves part of the educational process. I must say that it hurts me to have people joke about the number of coaches and hear laughing and clapping about that. It is a distressing mood.

I may be the wrong guy to say this because we have won the national championship the last two years, and when you get to that position sometimes people just don't listen to you because everything is going well for you. But I implore you to have a better relationship and a better understanding of what is going on with the coaches. We are trustworthy, we are teachers and we are your closest link to why we are here—the student-athlete. We understand by daily minute lines what is happening with our student-athletes.

If you don't at least listen, that is wrong. You don't have to agree, but just listen. That is all we are asking for. We understand who is in charge. We understand who has the power. This is not about power. This is about making appropriate decisions that will provide the best climate for our student-athletes. In that regard, this proposal should be voted upon favorably. We are not against reducing scholarships or cost containment. When this was enacted, maybe

enough thought had been put into the timeliness of it.

But to go from 15 to 14 in one year and 14 to 13 the next year, that does not give you adequate time for planning. Coaches may have recruited a class of five. If they knew this was going to be enacted, they would recruit a class of four. That is common. The potential harm to student-athletes is unbelievable if we don't get time to study it. That is what you would do if your history or economics department was looking at a change. If your basketball situation is going through a personnel change, we certainly need to look at that.

Lastly, we are in favor and I feel really good for the women's coaches that their scholarship limit was reinstated at 15. They understand their situation. They may have provided proper input for a favorable vote. We are not asking for things like that. What we are asking for is what is appropriate for the student-athletes we teach and we coach. I would hope that you would have empathy for us and for the student-athletes we represent.

James E. Delany (Big Ten Conference): I would like to speak briefly about some of the proposals that will be before you next year from the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics.

We have made a very strong effort to focus on operational excesses, not on student-athletes and coaches. Please think about the number of scholarships that we have under this proposal. Our focus and our time next year will be to work with coaches on cutting out excessive operational expenses.

I rise to ask the Convention to think about a one-year moratorium on the cut from 15 to 14 to 13 because I think you will have a proposal next year that looks at various ways to contain costs, but not at the cost of student-athletes and coaches. I think we will make a strong proposal next year. I am sure there will be a lot of debate. I am not sure this one scholarship in this one sport is going to send the wrong message because I think that we are at a critical point in the sport of basketball where we need these athletes to maintain good practice opportunities.

[Proposal No. 30 (Page A-45) was defeated by Division I, 134-178, 10 abstentions; motion to reconsider defeated 152-169, five abstentions, roll-call votes.]

Financial Aid Limitations—Men's Ice Hockey

Otto Breitenbach (Western Collegiate Hockey Association): I move Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 31-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The sponsors of Proposal No. 31-1 support the overall intentions of Proposal No. 31 with the sole exception of the proposed increase in the length and number of financial aid equivalencies in men's ice hockey.

Proposal No. 31-1 would restore that equivalency to 18, a number that most, if not all of us, can live with and that is consistent with the reform legislation recently approved at this Convention. We

understand that the Presidents Commission and the Council are opposed to Proposal No. 31 as written but would remove their opposition if No. 31-1 is approved. We therefore urge your support of Proposal 31-1, and if approved, your support of No. 31 as amended.

Mr. Breitenbach: The sponsors of Proposal No. 31 support the amendment as presented.

[Proposal No. 31-1 (Page A-48) was approved by Division I, 206-30, 80 abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Mr. Breitenbach: The purpose of Proposal No. 31 is to standardize the awarding of scholarship financial aid in college hockey throughout the membership. There are three important facets of it.

Number one, the standardizing of the number of scholarships. Eighteen is recommended by the Presidents Commission.

Number two is the fact that we have 30 maximum counters in the sport of hockey.

Number three, we want all multiple-sports participants who receive financial aid to count in the sport of hockey. This legislation will help us in the sport of hockey to present the prepackage across the board to our student-athletes. We urge the Convention to support the proposal.

R. Wayne Edwards (University of Massachusetts, Lowell): I speak in support Proposal No. 31 as amended by No. 31-1.

I preface my comment by indicating that if Proposal 31-1 passes, the Presidents Commission will withdraw its opposition to Proposal No. 31. This legislation will accomplish two important objectives. One, with the annual limitation of 30 counters, it will contribute to a level playing field of both public and private institutions. Two, the multisport athlete provisions whereby an ice hockey player can compete in another sport will eliminate the current practice at some institutions whereby ice hockey players are disguising themselves as golfers, tennis or baseball players.

This proposal is extremely important to the integrity of ice hockey. I urge hockey-playing and non-hockey-playing institutions alike to support Proposal No. 31 as amended.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): Speaking on behalf of the Presidents Commission, we withdraw our opposition to No. 31 as amended.

John M. Marinatto (Providence College): I am in support of Proposal No. 31 as amended. But I would like to ask for a parliamentary or staff interpretation with regard to this proposal. With the effective date of August 1993, would current student-athletes be allowed to continue in their two-sport status or would they be restricted by this proposal?

Ms. Dreidame: With the effective date of August 1, 1993, they would have to count as of that date.

Michael A. Ploszek (University of Maine): I urge the Convention to vote in support of Proposal No. 31 as amended by No. 31-1. It will enhance our commitment to cost containment while maintaining a positive balance between financial aid and roster counters.

Most importantly, it strengthens the integrity of ice hockey by

eliminating the multisport counter. With the effective date of August 1, 1993, I urge your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 31 (Page A-46) was approved by Division I, 216-14, 90 abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Division I Baseball

Glen C. Tuckett (Brigham Young University): I move Proposal No. 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to increase traditional and nontraditional segments of the baseball season from 22 to 24 weeks.

Some points to consider, please. We are talking about practice opportunities, not increasing the number of games. Baseball skills are difficult to acquire and to master. The traditional segment (spring) is determined by the prearranged scheduling of games. Because weather can be so unpredictable, schools in the North often are denied opportunity for practice and scheduled games. In the fall, the nontraditional segment usually is more predictable in the Northern climates. This proposal would allow more effective use of baseball practice time. Northern and Southern schools will have an opportunity to maximum outdoor workouts and evaluations.

Another point: of the four most popular men's spring sports—track, tennis, volleyball and baseball—the only team sport is baseball. The others are classified as individual sports and playing and practice days are less restrictive. Baseball coaches really need an antidote for the fickleness of the weather conditions. Baseball is not looking for an advantage, just equality. Therefore, I solicit your support of Proposal No. 34.

Jerry Kindall (American Baseball Coaches Association): I rise in support of the position that Mr. Tuckett has explained to you and represent to you the views of our 5,000-member association.

The uncertainty of the weather, particularly in the Northern and Eastern states, is a major reason for this proposal. It is not uncommon in baseball to lose three or four consecutive days to inclement weather. Over the 22 weeks presently provided, that amounts to 20 percent or more of our season. The two additional weeks also would afford the coaching staff, which already is sorely reduced in numbers, much needed teaching time with our student-athletes.

I respectfully submit that the two additional weeks would be devoted to practice, not outside competition or to travel, which create class conflicts. Please restore to us these two weeks so we can be more effective teachers.

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 34.

This proposal is contrary to reform legislation adopted by the membership at the 1991 Convention to reduce the amount of time student-athletes are required to participate in athletically related activities. This proposal will increase the number of weeks in which institutions may conduct their baseball-playing seasons and thus will increase costs for athletics programs. It also lessens time for student-athletes to devote to academics or other aspects of collegiate life. I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 34.

[Proposal No. 34 (Page A-50) was defeated by Division I, 42-272, nine abstentions, roll-call vote.]

[The Division I business session was recessed at 11:10 a.m.]

Friday Morning, January 15, 1993

The Division I business session was called to order at 10:15 a.m. by Division I Vice President R. Elaine Dreidame, University of Dayton.

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Dreidame: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to call the Division I business session to order. We are ready to complete the Division I agenda for this Convention. The chair wishes to announce that Proposal No. 60 has been withdrawn.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Coaching Limitations—Division I

Carolyn Schlie Femovich (University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Ivy Group, I move Proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

In all sports except football and basketball, this proposal will allow coaches who are designated as a head or assistant in one sport to be counted as a restricted-earnings coach in another sport and not be subject to the \$12,000 restricted-earnings salary cap.

This amendment will allow institutions to minimize coaching costs if it chooses to assign an individual to coach more than one sport. Many institutions with broad-sponsorship programs have legitimate two-sport coaching responsibilities. Under the current legislation, these individuals must be counted as head or assistant coaches in both sports in order to pay them more than \$12,000. This proposal will allow institutions to continue to assign coaching responsibilities and compensate that individual with more than \$12,000. That is far more economical than hiring an additional restricted-earnings coach. The institution could not exceed the total number of full-time or part-time earnings coaches in those sports.

I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 61 (Page A-83) was approved by Division I.]

Recruiting—Division I Basketball

James Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is intended to address the summer evaluation period.

In basketball, there are summer camps conducted throughout the country. During that time, many prospects—Division I, Division II and Division III players—participate in these camps. In that short time period, coaches have an opportunity to see many, many prospects without waiting until the fall or winter when their teaching starts or it is much more difficult to see that many players.

The intent of Bylaw 11.7.5.1 was to reduce the number of coaches permitted to recruit off campus at one time to two from the previous three—the head coach and two assistants. However, the experience

of last summer projects that the goal of cost reduction was not achieved. As coaches tried to make the proper analysis of prospective student-athletes, it became a part of their process for three coaches to get together after the summer period to discuss the quality of the various players to decide who they would recruit so they don't waste time or money recruiting prospects who eventually would not play for them anyway. As a result, two coaches try to do a quality job of evaluation while one coach basically passes his time on campus.

Although the intent of the legislation was a good one, we are finding that costs are escalating, not decreasing. Based on these considerations of cost containment, we urge your adoption of Proposal No. 64.

Betty Jaynes (Women's Basketball Coaches Association): On behalf of Division I women's basketball coaches, I would like to speak in favor of this proposal to permit all three full-time Division I men's and women's basketball coaches to recruit off campus during the summer evaluation period, which consists of just three weeks in the month of July.

In 1992, when this piece of legislation was originally drafted, the intent was to keep one coach on campus during the academic year, which in turn would reduce costs. However, the legislation has been applied to include the three-week period in July when Division I college coaches traditionally have had an unrestricted opportunity to evaluate hundreds of prospective student-athletes.

More importantly and contrary to all logic and intent, reducing the number of coaches off campus from three to two during this period is not more cost effective. The WBCA-member Division I college coaches who have participated, would concur that 60 percent of our coaches surveyed reported spending an average of \$3,000 more during these periods. This was due to the loss of Saturday stay-overs and the increased need to fly instead of drive. Considering the airlines' fare wars that existed this past summer, that figure would have been higher.

I strongly urge this body to adopt Proposal No. 64.

William M. Sangster (Georgia Institute of Technology): On behalf of the Council, I want to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 64.

This proposal will permit all three full-time Division I men's and women's basketball coaches to recruit off campus during the summer evaluation period. This legislation, which limits two Division I coaches to recruit prospective student-athletes off campus at any one time during the summer, was enacted to assist institutions in reducing recruiting costs. It was inherent in such a limitation that institutions should more effectively examine those prospects who the institution wishes to recruit to participate in the intercollegiate basketball program.

It was not the intent of the legislation to compromise the safety of any coaching staff members or to increase responsibility of individual staff members in recruiting prospects during the summer vacation periods.

Further, contrary to what proponents of the legislation may argue, an increase in the number of coaches who may recruit off campus

during the summer evaluation period could result in an increased cost to an institution, particularly when said coaches are not involved in the observing of prospective athletes at the same site.

The proposal seems to be contrary to the efforts by the Council and the Presidents Commission to assist the membership in reducing costs in intercollegiate athletics programs. I urge you to defeat this proposal.

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): In evaluating how you are going to vote on No. 64, please think through the reason it was enacted—to keep somebody on campus to evaluate proper academic progress of the students and for cost containment.

No. 64 simply says that out of 52 weeks in the year, let our coaches go to multiple camp sites for three weeks in the summer, and let them evaluate, which as Betty Jaynes has indicated has been more costly.

If you really are concerned with the cost effectiveness, please allow the coaches that short three-week period in the summer to enhance the recruiting efforts in a more cost-effective manner. This is not an erosion of what the presidents have set out to accomplish. It is very, very fine tuning. Please support Proposal No. 64.

[Proposal No. 64 (Page A-85) was approved by Division I.]

Coaching Limitations

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 65.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think the rationale as listed in the Convention Program adequately explains the limitations. The recommendation from the Interpretations Committee has resulted from the advent of coaching limitations where a number of coaches were reassigned to other administrative roles within the athletics department to avoid being counted as a coach in the applicable sport.

Realizing that is oftentimes difficult to define, the Interpretations Committee has recommended this new definition, which I think more adequately defines those activities in which an individual engages in to immediately be counted within the coaching limitations of that sport.

There is no legislation related to the administrative staff limits and maybe that will be a topic that at some later date the Convention will consider. As far as it pertains to the coaching staff limitations, we believe this definition closes the loopholes and makes the limitations more easily understood. We recommend the adoption of Proposal No. 65.

[Proposal No. 65 (Page A-86) was approved by Division I.]

Professional Enhancement Camps

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit coaches and administrators to participate in formal professional enhancement programs such as the NFL Minority Coaches Fellowship Program. It will be a benefit to all individuals and organizations that participate.

The Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee feels that a formal professional enhancement plan of that nature is vital to our profession. Whereas, these focus to address issues to minority interests and opportunities, it could better serve the Association by permitting all athletics department members to participate in well-established, tightly defined and implemented formal professional enhancement programs. This would include allowing the participants to receive compensation and expenses consistent with what other program participants receive.

It further suggests that the Council establish necessary policies and guidelines regarding participation in such programs. These guidelines could be set by the Council or various NCAA committees. I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 66.

[Proposal No. 66 (Page A-87) was approved by Division I.]

Coaches—Endorsement of Noninstitutional Publications

Kay Don (California State University, Long Beach): On behalf of the Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would preclude athletics staff members from endorsing publications dedicated solely to reporting on an athletics program of a particular institution, including information on the institution's prospective student-athletes in recruiting. Often, the publications contain a full-page advertisement containing written statements for the magazine by institutional administrators, including encouragement to subscribe to the publication.

It was felt that these publications provide an opportunity for inequity in the recruiting process for institutions that have such publications reporting on them. Since these magazines often are located in the community of the institution, the magazine will pay transportation and other expenses for prospects to visit the community in order that photographs can be taken. These photos and interviews then are featured in the magazine. The NCAA should not be involved in any attempt to regulate or control the publications. However, NCAA institutions should not be involved in promoting such publications.

Since the actual connection between the institution and the publication is strongly implied with these ads, this legislation attempts to put distance between the institutions and these publications. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 67 (Page A-87) was approved by Division I.]

Coaches—Scouting-Service Consultant

Vincent J. Dooley (University of Georgia): On behalf of the Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 68.

[The motion was seconded.]

Some scouting services list institutional coaches and staff members as board members or advisers. This proposal will eliminate the perception that these staff members are involved in any manner with the scouting or recruiting service.

Further, this proposal will eliminate any misconceptions to a

prospect by paying for the information offered by the recruiting service. I encourage your support of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 68 (Page A-88) was approved by Division I.]

Initial Eligibility—Test-Score Requirement

Margie McDonald (Western Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 69.

Proposal No. 69 would rectify inequities suffered by student-athletes who took the ACT between 1989 and 1992 and achieved at least a score of 16.5. It seems inappropriate not to apply the most accurate standard known to these student-athletes. For the ACT, the Academic Requirements Committee and the NCAA Council to admit the erroneous recorded score and not take full corrective action is inconsistent with the principles of fair treatment for which this Association stands.

The current rule results in identical test-score performance by student-athletes in separate years being treated differently without any membership alteration of initial-eligibility standards. It is my recollection and the recollection of many associated with the NCAA longer than I, that this ruling is the first and only of its kind in the history of the Association. It always has been the policy of the NCAA to equitably treat the student-athlete when a change in standard was required. Through no fault of these particular student-athletes, they are being unduly punished.

I know that our committee said this could result in a competitive advantage for certain member institutions. It is time that this Association admits its mistake and gets the benefit where it belongs, to the student-athlete, without whom we would have no purpose here today.

Also, I have been requested to provide the number of student-athletes that this new legislation might effect. It seems to me a moot point because if only one student-athlete was affected it is one too many.

Let's balance the interest of the student-athlete with the limited institutional competitive interest involved. I respectfully ask for a "yes" vote on Proposal No. 69, so as not to deny young people what they have fairly earned.

Joan C. Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): Speaking on behalf of our student-athletes, I urge you to support Proposal No. 69. This is an opportunity to right a wrong. We live in an imperfect society. This is an example of a mistake we made in interpreting a test score.

Why should student-athletes who entered college in 1990 be treated differently than those who entered in 1991? If they had the same test scores, one group paid for a year of school and three years of eligibility while the other gets four years of scholarship. Let me remind you these young men and women received no scholarship in their freshman year. We should at least let them compete the four years.

I realize the solution is not perfect. But at least it is an attempt to be fair. Let us right a wrong.

David B. Keilitz (Central Michigan University): On behalf of the Council, I rise to speak in opposition to this proposal.

Let me give you a brief history of how this 18 score came about. In

October 1989, the ACT began to administer the enhanced ACT assessment and recommended that a score of 18 on the enhanced test was in accordance with the score of 15 on the prior exam. The NCAA amended Bylaw 14.3 to reflect this information. In May 1991, the ACT submitted research to the NCAA that provided an updated estimate between ACT and SAT exams. These materials were based on additional studies and indicated a close association between an SAT score of 700 and an ACT score of 17 rather than 18.

The Research Committee and the Academic Requirements Committee reviewed the ACT studies and recommended to the Council that they be accepted as valid. In October 1991, the Council concluded that the change from 18 to 17 should not be retroactive. There are many reasons for this conclusion. A major reason is the issue of competitive equity. This actually affects two classes of high-school graduates—the class of 1990 as well as the class of 1991. By the time the ACT studies were first reported to the NCAA, the 1990 class already had completed its first year of college and many of the 1991 class had already completed the admissions and recruiting process.

Member institutions had made recruiting and admissions decisions based on the score of 18. Many institutions did not recruit or admit students with a score of 17 because they were not qualifiers or partial qualifiers. To retroactively change the status of these students at this time would certainly be unfair to those institutions.

Division II has defeated this proposal. The Council urges you to defeat this proposal.

Robert J. Desiderio (University of New Mexico): I ask the membership to approve Proposal 69.

A mistake was made and students are paying the brunt of that mistake. It would be unfair, unjust and discriminatory against these two classes of students who were eligible but now are being treated as if they were ineligible.

They have been labeled partial or nonqualifiers or "Prop 48s." Yet, they are not so. I do not understand how we can balance the competitive equity above the rights of at least one student, let alone two classes of students.

I therefore ask that this body approve Proposal No. 69.

Elizabeth Fahey Albright (Pennsylvania State University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 69. It provides an opportunity for a limited number of student-athletes who were caught in the dead zone in the old regulation and new regulation. It may be a mistake, but we were still caught there. This proposal is not an issue of finance or competitive advantage, it is an issue of participation and opportunity. This proposal provides a handful of student-athletes a great opportunity. To deny the opportunity to participate is contradictory to the NCAA admission statement and competitiveness.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee asks for your support of Proposal No. 69.

James M. Klein (University of Toledo): This legislation was established to correct a minimum ACT score of 17 as opposed to 18. The scores set up two classifications of student-athletes and effec-

tively discriminate against one of these classes for no legitimate reason.

The first class consists of student-athletes who took the ACT test in October 1989, scored 17 and enrolled in their institutions on or after August 1, 1992. The second class consists of student-athletes who took the ACT test after October 28, 1989, scored 17 and enrolled in their institutions before August 1, 1992. The first score created qualifiers and athletes; the second score did not. This is discrimination pure and simple and it may be unconstitutional. Proposal No. 69 would eliminate this by making the 17 test score retroactive for the purpose of competition only.

Apart from the potential legal ramifications, Proposal No. 69 promotes fairness and equity for student-athletes. For these reasons, I urge you to support Proposal No. 69.

Bonnie Slatton (University of Iowa): I have a question on the interpretation. How does this affect transfer students who are non-qualifiers and are at two-year institutions?

Would they not have to graduate from the two-year college or would they have to?

Ms. Dreidame: They would not have to have graduated. That is correct.

[Proposal No. 69 (Page A-88) was approved by Division I.]

Seasons of Competition—Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier

Charles Theokas (Temple University): I move Proposal No. 70.

[The motion was seconded.]

Let me congratulate the group on successfully passing Proposal No. 69 in spirit of fairness for student-athletes.

I would like to read very briefly one small portion of the rationale behind Proposal No. 70. The purpose of this legislation simply is to permit a fourth season of eligibility after the student-athlete has proven his or her academic success.

Normally, when a piece of legislation like this keeps coming back, nothing has happened. However, this group has demonstrated by virtue of strengthening the initial-eligibility as well as the satisfactory-progress rule that there could be change as it relates to this particular student-athlete who for all intents and purposes has the right to play that fourth year.

The satisfactory-progress rule that we have put in has made it tighter. If a student-athlete is able to successfully complete those requirements, it seems not only fair but the right thing to do in the spirit of what this Convention has done. I am very pleased that in the spirit of fairness we passed Proposal No. 58, which finally is talking about equity and the rights of student-athletes. I encourage this group to very seriously consider this piece of legislation. Be fair to those students who have earned the right to play that last year of school.

Jason C. Wilkie (Central Michigan University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee feels that this proposal is in the best interest of student-athletes.

It is our opinion that this proposal has three positive effects for athletes. First, this proposal provides an extra incentive for student-

athletes to meet satisfactory-progress requirements. Secondly, there could be many reasons why the athlete is labeled a partial or non-qualifier. Often these are a result of social or functional backgrounds that do not promote academic success. However, because a student is labeled "Prop 48" does not mean that he cannot perform in a college academic arena. This legislation not only promotes academic success, but gives student-athletes a tangible reward. Thirdly, I remind opponents to this legislation that athletes must still make a standard of academic success that the NCAA has established. Emphasis has been placed on giving athletes opportunities to graduate. This proposal expands those opportunities for a nonqualifier.

Janis Sanchez-Hucles (Old Dominion University): I stand to support this proposal. On Proposition 48, the outcome has suggested that stronger achievement exists for partial qualifiers than full qualifiers. This supports the idea that these partial qualifiers are taking academics very sincerely.

The rationale given to oppose this proposal is the need to send a strong signal to high-school students that they need to achieve success in the core curriculum. I agree with the sentiment. Yet we know that high-school students do not compete academically on level playing fields.

We can afford academic achievement and also give immediate reinforcement to those students who successfully comply with NCAA standards. Students who do not fully meet the academic standards of the NCAA are penalized. That message is clear. When students demonstrate the maturity and perseverance that is necessary to achieve satisfactory progress, they should be applauded, not punished. To do otherwise will send the wrong signal.

Herman R. Frazier (Arizona State University): On behalf of my colleagues in the Pacific-10 Conference, I rise to oppose Proposal No. 70.

The previous speaker said that this proposal sends mixed signals. This is beneficial for those institutions that already have recruited partial and nonqualifiers and provide substantial incentives for those students to meet satisfactory-progress requirements. The problem with this legislation is the signals that it sends to high-school students and their parents. It provides for alternative recruiting. They can go to those students and say if you come to our institution you will succeed and you will get the fourth season if you come to us. It provides a negative incentive to what we need and what we want. This Association is trying to send a clear message to high-school students, to prospective student-athletes and their families.

Students simply must achieve academically if they are going to be permitted to be a qualifier and enjoy all the benefits of student-athletes in Division I institutions. I strongly urge the Convention to defeat this proposal.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): The previous speaker has accurately identified the dilemma we face. We can either let our fears about the effects on high-school students overcome us and close the door completely to a fourth season of eligibility for partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers who earned the right in a classroom for that sea-

son, or we can assume our responsibility when recruiting those students to make it clear that they need to be qualifiers, if at all possible, and at the same time at the other end reward all those students who do earn the right in the classroom.

If we do not pass Proposal 70, we face the continuing possibility that two students—one a qualifier and one a nonqualifier—at the end of their fourth year of college will have different athletics futures. They may have the same grade-point average and the same major and same academic success, but one will have another year of athletics eligibility and one of them will not.

Because we have that standard in the book now, that is looking backward. We should have a standard that is forward looking and gives us every incentive for all students, once they are in school, to do as well as they can in the classroom in order to have the privilege of athletics participation.

I urge you to pass Proposal 70 and give them that chance.

Richard J. Dunn (University of Washington): I first have a question. Am I correct in assuming that this also will apply to past transfer students?

Ms. Dreidame: Yes, that is a correct assumption.

Mr. Dunn: That furthers my concern. While we may be giving a particular message to the high schools, we also are sending messages to one another about the entire matter—keeping people eligible for three years if they are partial qualifiers so we can have them for a fourth year.

I am concerned about that because of the implications for transfer students.

John L. Allen (University of Connecticut): Having sat on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Athletics Representative Association with both Professor Dunn and Professor Kingston, I am not happy to disagree with them. But I am forced to disagree with them.

I think it is imperative that we vote in the affirmative on this proposal. We have heard talk about sending messages. To whom are we sending the message? If you assume that the message is being sent to high-school students, then I think we are making a mistake. We already have sent very strong messages to high-school students over the last five years. We have sent messages to them that say you must achieve a satisfactory grade-point average in your high-school studies. You must achieve a satisfactory passing score on the college-entrance examination. You must achieve a rigorous core-rate requirement. If you do not do so, you will not receive a grant-in-aid. You will not be allowed to participate in your chosen sport when you enter college as a freshman. That is a powerful message. I agree with that message.

But if we are to assume that a high-school student hears the results of an affirmative vote on Proposal No. 70, many will go through the thought process of saying to himself or herself, "Well, if I slough off in my studies, if I don't pay attention to schoolwork, I don't get to play as a freshman and I may not get any kind of financial assistance that is athletically related, but in four, five or six years down the road, maybe I will have that season of eligibility restored." Then

I think we are assuming that high-school students operate on a different wavelength than they really operate on. Many of you in this room have raised teenagers, as I have. It is difficult to convince a teenager to do what is right today on how it will benefit him or her tomorrow, let alone next week, next month, next year. They simply don't think that way. They don't project that way in the future. We all know that high-school students, particularly male student-athletes, will say that I am going to play in the NBA. I am going to play in the NFL. I am going to play in the major leagues. That is a dream of youth.

Let's forget about the message sent to high-school students. That is not to whom we are sending this message. We are sending this message of Proposal No. 70 to the collegiate student-athlete who has been involved in an institution as a partial or nonqualifier. The message we are sending to that student is if you have performed to the rigorous standards of satisfactory progress established by this Association over the past few years, and if you have performed to the level of expectations of your institution, we will restore your fourth year of eligibility. We will allow you that additional season of inter-collegiate competition. That is not the wrong message. That is the right message. We worry a lot about graduation rates and entrance rates. If you want to improve graduation rates and retention rates, pass this proposal.

What this is all about is a second chance. There probably is not anybody in this room that has not at some point or another been given a second chance. Let's give these kids who have earned it a second chance. A lot of what we do in this Association is based on performance and reward. Let's reward performance and let's vote in the affirmative and pass Proposal No. 70.

Robert J. Frank (Oregon State University): I rise to speak in opposition.

I think that the big problem is that coaches on the recruiting trail are going to send a message to high-school students that if you come to our institution, your first year will be a redshirt year and you will have four years of eligibility and Prop 48 doesn't matter any more. To me this is a substantial cutting of Prop 48. It will be perceived by the press, the public and the high schools in that way.

I think that it is a big step backwards. I urge defeat of this resolution.

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the MAAC, we propose and request a motion for a roll call on this vote given the closeness in past seasons.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): One more message sent by recruiting coaches is to say to prospects you will not be able to practice your freshman year even though you practiced in this sport for many years and you will not have any aid. This is the parting message that goes with this proposition. I urge your support.

Carla H. Hay (Marquette University): I agree that we are sending a message and that we are including messages to college students. It seems to me the message that we are sending is that we are not in-

terested in them trying to get a degree and graduate in four years and leave our institution, but encouraging them to think of one more year of competition, which means a five-year student.

Our goal should be to see to it that these young people get their degree in a timely fashion and move on with their lives.

Frank Pergolizzi (St. Francis College (Pennsylvania)): Does not the effective date mean that this legislation would not apply to students who currently are enrolled in any collegiate institutions?

Ms. Dreidame: That is a correct interpretation.

David H. Bennett (Syracuse University): There has been much discussion; messages sent and messages received. In 1983 when this Association voted for what was then called Proposition 48, the argument that was most discussed was that it would be a fair message to students, to their parents, to their counselors and to their schools.

If we pass Proposal No. 70, we will be substantially weakening that message. It seems to me that this will be the most significant backward step that this Association has taken in weakening the reform agenda that began in 1983.

[Proposal No. 70 (Page A-89) was defeated by Division I, 148-164, six abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Initial Eligibility—Change in Sport Classification

Michael L. Kasavana (Michigan State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move Proposal No. 71.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 71 will permit Division I and Division II athletes currently playing a Division III sport to apply during the 1993-94 academic year only, Division III freshman eligibility requirements provided the institution continued to apply Division III financial aid guidelines in that sport during the 1993-94 academic year.

This amendment will provide these institutions an opportunity to gear up their admissions and registrar offices to certify eligibility of additional student-athletes. It also will be a means of saving these institutions significant costs that otherwise will be required as a result of this mandated reclassification.

I urge you to adopt Proposition No. 71.

[Proposal No. 71 (Page A-90) was approved by Division I.]

Individual Eligibility—Change in Sport Classification

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Football Conference): I move Proposal No. 72.

[The motion was seconded.]

As a result of the adoption of Proposal No. 53 at the 1991 Convention, all Division I institutions that currently sponsor Division II football or Division III nonscholarship football will be required to reclassify their football programs to Division I-AA if they wish to continue to sponsor those programs.

As a consequence, a limited number of student-athletes may be adversely affected during this transition by the application of more restrictive eligibility rules in Division I. This amendment will permit a student-athlete to participate in a sport classified in Divisions II or III while enrolled in a Division I institution before August 1, 1993, and who remains enrolled in that institution to complete the stu-

dent-athlete's eligibility subject to the application of Division II or Division III eligibility legislation.

I urge the adoption of Proposal No. 72.

[Proposal No. 72 (Page A-91) was approved by Division I.]

Individual Eligibility

Michael M. Gilleran (West Coast Conference): I move adoption of Proposal No. 76.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would apply in Division I to women who initially enrolled as full-time students before the 1981-82 academic year. We would hope that the delegates would share our belief that women who enrolled before women's athletics was governed by the NCAA should not have their eligibility measured by a more restrictive Division I five-year rule.

We believe that these women, however few or many there might prove to be, who first enrolled before NCAA championship opportunities were available to women, should, in the interest of fairness, be allowed to use the less restrictive, more flexible 10-semester, 15-quarter approach utilized in Divisions II and III. We view this as a common-sense method and a fair method of providing opportunities to a class of individuals who otherwise would be denied a chance to experience the athletics opportunities that now are provided to women by the NCAA.

We would respectfully urge the support of the delegates in adopting this proposal.

[Proposal No. 76 (Page A-96) was approved by Division I.]

Individual Eligibility—Graduate Student

Jerry L. Kingston (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA Council joins in sponsoring this proposal, which will permit a student-athlete who has graduated and who continues enrolled as a full-time student at the institution from which he or she has graduated to remain eligible while taking course work that would lead to the equivalent of another major or degree, even if the institution's policy is not to grant a second undergraduate degree.

A student-athlete should not be penalized simply because the institution from which he or she graduated does not award a second undergraduate degree, as long as the course the student-athlete is taking would lead to another major degree.

I urge you to support this proposal.

Katy Arris (University of Texas at Austin/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports this proposal.

One of the goals of the membership is to graduate student-athletes. Currently there are student-athletes who delay graduation and maintain eligibility. The passage of Proposal No. 77 will increase educational opportunities for graduating student-athletes with remaining eligibility. This encourages student-athletes to finish their degrees expeditiously and creates another option for graduating student-athletes.

We are urging your support for Proposal No. 77.
[Proposal No. 77 (Page A-96) was approved by Division I.]

Financial Aid—Individual Limitation

Jerry I. Porras (Stanford University): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

Bylaw 15.2.6 currently requires an institution to include earnings from a student employed during a semester or term in determining whether his or her full grant-in-aid has been reached. This proposal would exempt from that limitation the earnings of a student-athlete who has exhausted his or her eligibility in the prior academic year.

This focus on the prior academic year means that students who exhausted their eligibility in a fall semester or quarter could not work in a subsequent term even though they may no longer compete in intercollegiate athletics. Even though they no longer are eligible to compete, this creates such a substantial hardship on some students that they may drop out of school and may wind up not graduating.

Allowing a student-athlete to work would not put an excessive amount of time on them since they no longer are part of the varsity sport, giving them more time for their academic pursuit or employment. The proposed change has no negative impact on the institution while at the same time is providing support for student-athletes to graduate. Anything we can do in this regard will certainly be desirable.

I urge the adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 83 (Page A-100) was approved by Division I.]

Financial Aid—Pell Grant

William M. Sangster (Georgia Institute of Technology): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA Council has joined in the sponsorship of Proposal No. 87. I urge you to adopt that proposal.

Because the Federal government recently adopted legislation to increase the amount of money an individual could receive from a Pell Grant, it makes sense that NCAA legislation also should be amended to allow student-athletes who qualify for such assistance to receive that assistance, plus a full grant-in-aid, provided that the total amount does not exceed the individual's cost of attendance.

Some people argue that NCAA legislation could not be amended in this manner because most individuals do not qualify for the full amount of the Pell Grant. However, it is the Council's opinion that those who might qualify for the full amount, no matter how few, should be entitled to receive the full amount.

Under current legislation with the \$1,700 cap, it is possible that a student-athlete who qualifies for more than \$1,700 would not receive the amount to which he or she is entitled.

On behalf of the Council, I urge your adoption of this proposal.

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): I oppose Proposal No. 87. The issues of the Pell Grant and financial aid entitlement in various forms have been here since 1983. I must continue to speak against them.

A full grant-in-aid is defined as tuition and fees, room and board, and course-related books. The remaining elements in a college-expense budget are transportation and miscellaneous personal expenses. This proposal is an effort to provide some student-athletes with more money than is already available for these expenses.

An increase to \$2,400, however, will benefit only some student-athletes at very few schools. National surveys that deal with the average cost of these miscellaneous expenses are much closer to or less than the current \$1,700 limitation provision. So for the majority of the institutions, there is simply no reason to pass this legislation and increase the limit. The Pell Grant issue in general continues to cause confusion. The facts must be made clear. Eligible Pell Grant recipients receive every Federal dollar of Pell Grant they are entitled to. If grants to the students are greater than the current \$1,700, simply reduce the institutional dollars required to fund the maximum grants-in-aid. If you increase the maximum award ceiling, you increase your institutional cost. This is not cost containment. It clearly is not any way to face the challenge of the spiraling costs of scholarships.

This is legislation primarily for the benefit of the fully funded programs and will further the advantage between the haves and the have-nots. Another hazard of this proposal is the effective date of it—immediately. This means that institutions that have awarded the Pell Grant recipients will have to recompute their current year equivalency computations. Institutions in any case will have to review financial aid packages of all Pell Grant recipients to redo computation forms. This simply is unnecessarily disruptive to the financial aid process, which is geared on the academic year basis.

Finally, it must be emphasized that NCAA legislation should not and must not be considered independent financial aid legislation. The higher education amendments of 1992, which became law after this proposal was submitted, have dramatically changed the financial aid award system and unified the formula for Pell Grant eligibility with the same formula as eligibility for work-study and other Federal financial aid programs. Beginning in 1993-94, it no longer will be a matter of only the needy students getting the Pell Grant. The Pell Grant program is not the same financial aid program it was when this rule was conceived.

The NCAA's treatment of Pell Grant and other programs is simply archaic. New financial aid models are forthcoming from the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics. I encourage your attention to that.

As for this specific proposal, I can think of no beneficial purpose for increasing the Pell Grant limitation. I urge you to oppose it.

John J. Coyle (Pennsylvania State University): I would like to speak in favor of this proposal for a number of reasons. One, remember that this proposal will allow student-athletes to receive moneys that are available. Secondly, there is an approval process in place that will take care of any problems and will be able to make sure that this is done in an appropriate way. Third, the program that exists is discriminatory to student-athletes at institutions that award

\$1,700 and miscellaneous money would be available. Fourth, it will reduce the temptation for student-athletes to be involved in illegal types of moneys at those institutions where the cost of attendance is high. I urge your support of No. 87.

[Proposal No. 87 (Page A-104) was approved by Division I.]

Summer Competition—Individual Sports

Percy Bates (University of Michigan): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 95.

[The motion was seconded.]

James Richardson (College Swimming Coaches of America): This proposal gives the right for individual-sport athletes to choose their summer training environment voluntarily. This right was revoked due to an interpretation in 1990 that we believe was based on an erroneous assumption—that individual-sport athletes need to be treated the same as team-sport athletes.

We strongly believe that individual-sport athletes have a unique set of needs. Number one, they usually are not seasonal sports. Many of these sports have year-round competition and training. Number two, many of these sports are training intensive. Student-athletes therefore need to be very selective in determining their training environment during the summer. Number three, because most of these student-athletes only will enjoy three remaining summers of training and competition, we believe they need to be restored the right to voluntarily choose the environment in which they train and compete.

We urge your adoption of Proposal No. 95.

Matthew Leightninger (Haverford College/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 95.

We feel that individual-sport athletes do not derive any significant benefit that would translate into an unfair advantage by competing together outside the collegiate season.

Obviously, swimmers competing individually is different than basketball team members practicing together. The off-season represents the most productive time for many student-athletes competing in individual sports because they are not subject to NCAA practice-time limitations. We feel it is important that the individual-sport athletes be given the opportunity to maximize their training by removing this limitation.

We urge your support of Proposal No. 95.

[Proposal No. 95 (Page A-110) was approved by Division I.]

Playing and Practice Seasons

Thomas I. Innacone (University of San Diego): I move Proposal No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

The need for this amendment stems from the inequity produced by recent restructuring legislation. It therefore is noncontroversial and is a fine-tuning detail.

As stated in Bylaw 20.9.3.2.1, with Council approval, institutions are permitted to designate one men's sport and one women's sport in which the NCAA does not sponsor championships to meet the divi-

sional sports-sponsorship criteria. However, those sports also must meet the requirements of Bylaw 17 in regard to the length of the practice and playing seasons. Currently, institutions with sports in which the NCAA does not sponsor championships must count all non-NCAA postseason competition in their declared playing-season limitation while schools with NCAA-championship sports may exempt one postseason championship from theirs. This amendment will establish the same practice and playing season for non-NCAA championship sports as permitted for championship sports.

I encourage your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 96 (Page A-110) was approved by Division I.]

First Contest Date—Division I Basketball

Charles Cavagnaro (Memphis State University): On behalf of the Council, three conferences and 16 member institutions, I move adoption of Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council has joined in sponsorship of this proposal, which will allow a Division I basketball team to play its first contest on the Friday after Thanksgiving as opposed to December 1.

One of the reasons the legislation was amended to move the start-date to December 1 was to reduce the length of the basketball season, thereby reducing the time demands on student-athletes. It has been argued that without a correspondent reduction in the number of contests, student-athletes will spend in some cases more time in the sport during the month of December. Further, this proposal will not cause students to miss additional class time inasmuch as the added time generally will be occurring during the Thanksgiving holidays when classes are not in session.

I urge adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 98 (Page A-113) was approved by Division I.]

First Contest Date Exception—Division I Basketball

Charles Cavagnaro (Memphis State University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

The rationale for Proposal No. 98 also is applicable to No. 99. Proposal No. 99 provides greater flexibility in utilizing the vacation period for competition. It is consistent with the Council-endorsed approval of the Alaska Shootout.

Returning the tournament to the Thanksgiving vacation period will minimize the loss of class time and reduce conflicts with examination periods. It also will serve to alleviate the compact December scheduling pattern that now is a problem for many NCAA member institutions and conferences. It also will permit an even greater cross-section of institutions to participate in the tournament, which is a long-time objective of tournament management. To date, the tournament has afforded 47 different institutions from 27 different states and 20 different athletics conferences this unique competitive and educational experience. My institution is one of the 47 teams from 27 different states and 20 conferences afforded this opportunity.

This proposal comes with the endorsement of the Council, of which I am a member. I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 99 (Page A-114) was approved by Division I.]
Marilyn Moniz-Kahoohanohano (University of Hawaii): I move adoption of Proposal No. 100.

[The motion was seconded.]

The University of Hawaii urges your support of Proposal No. 100. This legislation simply permits the annual exemption to stand alone in the once-in-four-year section.

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 100-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will amend Proposal No. 100 to limit the proposed exemption to once in four years. While the Council feels strongly that an annual exemption of the basketball contest in Hawaii as contemplated in the original proposal is contrary to the recently passed reform movement, it does sympathize with the scheduling problems for the University of Hawaii. The Council believes that it is more consistent with the reform movement for Hawaii to be on a once-in-four-year cycle.

The Council urges your support of 100-1.

[Proposal No. 100-1 (Page A-116) was approved by Division I.]

Ms. Moniz-Kahoohanohano: I seek your support of Proposal No. 100, as amended.

This legislation simply permits the University of Hawaii the exemption to stand alone in the once-in-four-year exemption. The passage of this legislation is crucial for our ability to attract Division I teams to the island and to permit us to financially support our athletics program. It gives Hawaii stability and allows us to schedule in advance without the fear of losing teams to other playing opportunities that arise. Teams now are forced to make a choice between Hawaii, or to break a commitment with that new opportunity.

It continues to give more schools the opportunity to participate without significantly increasing the contests for individual schools and allows you to bring your student-athlete to the island. The NCAA Council supports No. 100 as amended and recognizes Hawaii's difficulties in scheduling due to its unique geographical location.

We seek your support in voting "yes" for No. 100 as amended.

Kay Don (California State University, Long Beach): I rise to speak in favor of the proposal as amended.

The Council, in its many discussions, recognizes the uniqueness of the University of Hawaii's situation. It therefore proposed the amendment you just passed. With this change, I encourage you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 100 (Page A-115) was approved by Division I as amended by No. 100-1.]

Contest Exemptions—Division I Basketball

Ronald S. Perry (College of the Holy Cross): I move adoption of Proposal No. 101.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to permit Division I institutions to exempt annually the Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game from their maximum number of basketball contests.

This proposal is consistent with existing legislation that exempts annually in football the Kickoff Classic and the Pigskin Classic games. This legislation fits well within the parameters established by the Presidents Commission. It does not affect the maximum number of games and does not require missed class time on the part of our student-athletes.

I urge your support of Proposal No. 101.

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): I am pleased to speak on behalf of the sponsors and the Basketball Hall of Fame and urge your support of Proposal No. 101.

All of us are well aware of the great tradition represented in the Tip-Off Classic and the positive impact it has on the Basketball Hall of Fame. As with the Kickoff Classic in football, this event is worthy of attracting the top teams in the country and help highlight the start of the college basketball season. It therefore makes sense that NCAA legislation treats the Kickoff Classic in the same manner, permitting institutions in Division I to exempt this game from counting against the maximum contest limits on an annual basis rather than on a once-in-four-year basis.

I join the Basketball Hall of Fame in urging your support for Proposal No. 101.

[Proposal No. 101 (Page A-117) was approved by Division I.]

First Contest Date—Cross Country, Field Hockey and Water Polo

Miechelle O. Willis (Temple University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 103.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit competition the first weekend in September for the sports of cross country, field hockey and water polo consistent with traditional fall seasons starting dates already existing in the sports of football, women's volleyball and soccer.

I urge your support of Proposal No. 103.

[Proposal No. 103 (Page A-118) was approved by Division I.]

Maximum Dates of Competition—Divisions I and II Cross Country

James G. Malik (San Diego State University): I move Proposal No. 104.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment involves inequity for the sport of men's and women's cross country as a result of recent broad restructuring legislation. It therefore is considered noncontroversial and fine-tuning. I have been advised it has Council support.

The rationale, as stated in the Convention Notice, is clear. This amendment simply establishes a nontraditional cross country season for those institutions that do not sponsor track and field. It is consistent with the guidelines and opportunities in all other sports.

I encourage your support.

[Proposal No. 104 (Page A-119) was approved by Division I.]

Golf Practice Round—Time Limits

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation would specify that a practice round of golf on the

day before a tournament count as three hours regardless of the actual duration of the round. The three-hour computation is consistent with the limit that is applicable to activities on the day of the tournament. This is a common-sense, practical piece of legislation. It is difficult for golf coaches to predict and control the length of practice rounds at the tournament site. Practice rounds often are scheduled around the tee times of normal daily play on the course. It therefore is difficult for coaches to know how much time to reserve to stay within the 20-hour limit for that week.

I don't believe there is any harm caused by that proposal. The student-athletes are already at the site of the tournament. There is no additional class time that is missed. It simply will provide the golf coach an opportunity to plan the week's practice schedule by knowing how much time to reserve for the practice round on the day before the tournament.

I urge your support of Proposal No. 107.

Mary Jo Warner (George Washington University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I wish to speak in opposition to No. 107.

While this may seem like an innocuous proposal, it could potentially increase the amount of time that a student-athlete spends on the sport. This is contrary to the recent reform efforts to reduce time demands on the student-athlete. Every effort to increase the time spent by student-athletes in this sport, no matter how small, represents an erosion of the reform movement.

Under current legislation, a practice round of golf must be included in the limit of 20 hours. However, under this proposal, a practice round before a tournament would only count as three hours regardless of the duration. Therefore, a practice round that lasts four to five hours would be only counted for three hours for the purpose of the limit.

On behalf of the Council, I urge you to defeat this proposal.

John R. Means (Golf Coaches Association of America): I speak in behalf of Proposal No. 107.

Although the reform movement has been beneficial to the student-athlete, the present rule for practice round has failed to accomplish the goals of the reform movement. The legislative committee of the coaches association has written this proposal to ensure compliance with the 20-hour-a-week rule and avoid possible legal action. It may be a situation that is unique to golf. We have found it impossible to actively budget and schedule a 20-hour week due to a lack of control over the situations pertaining to golf courses and normal competition. Most golf games last between three and four hours. Many times the golf course is not closed to the public and causes the practice run to last five and one-half hours.

If four hours for the practice round have been budgeted, we are left with only two options. One, take the players off the golf course or, two, the coach can vacate the golf course, leaving it unsupervised and unattended, which can lead to liability problems and/or worse if someone should get struck by a golf ball and get hurt.

Coaches have followed the letter of this rule, but not the spirit of the rule. You better serve notice on the 20-hour-week limitation. We

are asking the players in the community not to use the course for 20 hours. This will enable the coaches to accurately budget the schedule for the 20-hour-week and not be forced to leave their kids unsupervised.

This proposal will not change class time. It will bring uniformity in the 20-hour-a-week rule. Please note that the Presidents Commission does not oppose this proposal and this proposal was approved by Division II this morning.

I urge your support of Proposal No. 107.

Bradford W. Hovious (University of Texas at El Paso): In practicalities, I don't worry about the 20-hour rule in golf. They are going to be out there longer than that.

What you are saying in the reform movement is that you don't want your coaches to be around student-athletes more than 20 hours. This is a very practical piece of legislation and the NCAA Men's and Women's Golf Committee supports it. The fact is that a coach can walk off the course to get around the rule. It is that simple to get around the rule. It would be much simpler if everybody could just put down three hours, plan it as such, and go on from there.

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-122) was approved by Division I.]

Golf—College-Am Tournaments

James A. Castaneda (Rice University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 108-A. I have been informed that the sponsors have withdrawn Part B.

[The motion was seconded.]

Anyone who is interested in intercollegiate golf is well aware of the fact that fund-raising events are virtually the only source of revenue for our programs. Current legislation permits that college fund-raisers be held in conjunction with two-day tournaments but not in conjunction with three-day events.

This proposed legislation would simply extend the same privilege to three-day tournaments. The Faculty Athletics Representatives Association bases its opposition to Proposal No. 108 on the Legislative Review Committee's report of December 16, which states, "This proposal has the effect of extending the practice playing season."

I assume that opposition to this proposal is based on the misconception that the three-day tournament represents a challenge to the principle of cost containment and to the current mandated limitations on practice in playing seasons. In fact, nothing could be further from the truth. Let me hypothesize about two institutions that have had different preferences concerning two- and three-day tournaments. School A uses its maximum of 24 playing dates to schedule 12 of them. School B prefers three days and uses its 24 days to schedule eight such tournaments. School A, with 12 two-day tournaments, has committed to 12 trips involving all of the related expenditures of time and money as well as the use of 12 days devoted to pretournament practice rounds. School B, with eight three-day tournaments, has to travel far fewer times and has far fewer days of practice rounds. It simply is obvious that the three-day tournaments are not guilty as stated in the parallel position of extending the practice-playing season.

Some delegates who are skeptical about supporting this proposal

have expressed fear that if it passes it will lead to abuses with the addition of an extra day to the tournament format when a college match is scheduled. Bylaw 16.7.1 prohibits a team from departing from campus more than 48 hours before an away-from-home tournament. That has always run concurrently with the tournament-practice round and consists merely of the college golfers being joined in their practice rounds by noncollege golfers—virtually local golfers—who provide their financial support. This proposal does not call for any extension whatsoever of current limitations on practice and playing seasons. Its only gain is the format that in effect saves both time and money.

In the interest of generating revenue and in the spirit of equity, I urge your support for Proposal No. 108.

Kay Don (California State University, Long Beach): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 108.

This proposal would exempt college-am fund-raisers from the three-day tournament limit. While it is true that these college fund-raisers are a source of revenue for institutions, to eliminate them from the three-day limit could potentially increase the amount of time student-athletes in the sport of golf spend in their sport. Because this is contrary to the recent reform movement, I urge you to defeat this proposal.

Dianne Dailey (Wake Forest University): The intent of the proposal is to allow college-ams to be played on a practice day, which is a day before the tournament. College-ams will not extend the length of the tournament because students normally will be at the tournament site playing a practice round. Students do not win prizes for participation in these events, nor do they miss any more classes. College-ams provide the students a unique opportunity to raise much-needed money to support programs and the tournaments. In a time of cost containment, these events provide a very welcome relief.

Coaches have no intention of extending the tournament rounds beyond three days. If this intention is clear, the NCAA Council can issue the proper interpretation.

I urge you to allow the schools the means to raise money for their programs and tournaments, and ask for your support.

[Part A of Proposal No. 108 (Page A-123) was defeated by Division I, 129-153, nine abstentions, roll-call vote. Motion to reconsider defeated.]

[The Division I business session was recessed at noon.]

Friday Afternoon, January 15, 1993

The Division I business session was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with Division I Vice-President R. Elaine Dreidame, University of Dayton, presiding.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Contest Exemptions—Division I Ice Hockey

Terrence J. Toy (University of Denver): On behalf of the Western Collegiate Hockey Association, I move Proposal No. 110

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this legislation is to permit Division I institutions to exempt annually from the maximum number of hockey contests one game against the U.S. Olympic hockey team.

We have an interpretation from the legislative services staff that Division I refers to the institutions that play Division I ice hockey. I would point out that this exemption is operational only once every four years when there is an Olympic team. Ironically, we can exempt one team to play against a foreign national team but not against our own Olympic team. The proposed legislation will rectify that situation.

I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 110 (Page A-124) was approved by Division I.]

Dates of Competition—Indoor and Outdoor Track

Paul R. Rubincam Jr. (University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of my colleagues in the Ivy Group, I move Proposal No. 113.

[The motion was seconded.]

I ask for your vote in favor of Proposal No. 113. Its passage will correct a damaging although unintended hardship on the sport of track and field and the young men and women who are participating in our programs.

At last year's Convention, we recognized that the 24-week season is not sufficient for institutions sponsoring both indoor and outdoor track programs. The Convention voted down the 26-week, 156-day option. Proposal No. 113 asks the same type of relief in the area of dates of competition that currently exists in skiing and tennis. Proposal No. 113 applies to institutions utilizing indoor and outdoor track to meet minimum sports sponsorship requirements. Comparisons have been made to Proposal No. 137, which if adopted would cause indoor and outdoor track to count as a single sport for membership purposes.

These two proposals are not related. Whether or not Proposal No. 137 is defeated or adopted, the contest count limit will be unaffected. Regardless of your opinion on Proposal No. 137, I urge your adoption of Proposal No. 113. Two Conventions ago when we adopted in track 18-dates for competitions, we were told that if errors were made they would be corrected. We believe that we have an error. Eighteen contests may be an appropriate number of contests, but 18 is not an appropriate number of dates of competition to those of us offering both indoor and outdoor track. We have tried for two years to live with the 18-date competition and have found that this limitation places undue hardship on our programs and student-athletes. Proposal No. 113 will allow relief to institutions that need minimum sports sponsorship requirements in both indoor and outdoor track and field.

It is a compromise of what we currently allow for skiing and tennis. Skiing is permitted 16 dates of competition. However, in skiing a date of competition may be two days, effectively allowing skiing 22 days of competition. While in tennis, seven of its 25 days of competition may be multiday forums regardless of the number of days during which tournament competition takes place. We have recognized the nature and format of competition in skiing and tennis. We have

the right to afford to these sports the countable allowances now in place. Can we not also recognize that similarly there are many multiday competitions in the sport of track and field? There is not time to bring hundreds, if not thousands, to compete in track competition over a two-day period. Our own national championship meet runs three to five days. Also, let us not forget that in the sport of track and field, as many as 16 to 22 events occur in a single track meet.

Two of these events—the decathlon and the biathlon—are contested over a two-day period. If Proposal No. 113 is adopted, institutions meeting the minimum sports sponsorship requirements to both indoor and outdoor track can count a maximum number of six, two-day track meets to count as one date of competition each.

Passage of Proposal No. 113 will go a long way toward correcting an undue and unintended hardship in the sport of track and field.

Beverly D. Rouse Lewis (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I urge your support of this proposal.

The track and field committee has two sports—indoor and outdoor track—and the same number of dates of competition will be sponsored whether you sponsor one or both. It is particularly limiting to those institutions and student-athletes who wish to participate in relays such as the Drake Relays, the Penn Relays, the Texas Relays and the Kansas Relays that may last up to four days. It is possible for unusual athletes to compete in one relay meet, such as the Penn Relays, and use nearly one-fourth of the total allowable dates of competition. The 18-day limit is very restrictive to both the decathlon and the biathlon athletes who are competing in one event and using two days of competition. Finally, it simply is too restrictive for institutions that sponsor both indoor and outdoor track to be limited to the same number of competitions as those that sponsor only outdoor track.

I urge your adoption of this proposal.

Herman R. Frazier (Arizona State University): I rise in support of Proposal No. 113.

Proposal No. 113 will give the coaching staff flexibility. During the course of the year, many track and field meets are set up as two-day events. Track meets have preliminary competition the first day, which leads to the finals on the second day. Passage of No. 113 will allow coaching staff to decide how to manage this six times a year. Keep in mind that many of these divisional track meets are two-day competitions. Most conference championships are set up the same way. Let's not penalize the student-athlete who has an opportunity to compete in a competition that falls over a two-day period by charging him or her two days of competition for one meet.

I urge your support of No. 113.

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): On behalf of the Council, I speak in opposition to this proposal. It would result in an increase of the number of days of competition in indoor and outdoor track. It is contrary to the objectives of cost reduction and reducing time demands on student-athletes.

We urge you to vote against this proposal.

Gary K. Schwartz (University of Kansas): I am president of the

NCAA Division I Track and Field Coaches Association and a member of the NCAA Track and Field Committee. I would like to speak for our association in support of Proposal No. 113.

We feel that this is noncontroversial and is fine-tuning legislation. We were told in 1991 that we needed to come back and speak to this and we are. It is not counter to the reform movement. We don't look at it as creating more dates of competition or creating more cost to the institution.

I urge your support because of the reasons given by our first three speakers

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): Some institutions have indoor track and some institutions have outdoor track. Some conduct programs because they emphasize track and field in both indoor and outdoor seasons. However, we have assigned the same number of dates of competition to institutions that conduct one season or those that conduct both seasons.

As a member of the cost reduction committee, I was originally in favor of the present limits, with the clear understanding that we could come back at a later Convention and fine-tune the process to meet those areas where we had made a mistake. I do believe that this is one of those areas that requires fine-tuning. For example, if an individual runs in four-by-four relay trials on Friday and then comes back and runs the finals on Saturday, that counts as two dates of competition. Passage of this only affects the number of dates of competition revolving around meets set up over two days. There will be no increased lost class time. There will be no increased expense since teams usually travel as groups.

I ask you to support this legislation.

[Proposal No. 113 (Page A-126) was approved by Division I.]

Women's Volleyball—Preseason Alumni Match

Karol A. Kahrs (University of Illinois, Champaign): I move Proposal No. 114.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think the intent here is clear. This will allow the alumni match to occur in a regular cycle when the calendar permits it to occur and not be disruptive. It may be played the weekend before September 1 if September 1 does not fall on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday. There is no intent to extend the season and no intent to extend the time and preparation to be ready for the event.

Joan C. Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I support the amendment. As Karol said, there was no intent of the sponsors to have an earlier starting date as the legislation specifies. The Council asks for your support of this amendment and we ask for a post-Convention interpretation from the Council that would affirm this intention. The proposal does not jeopardize the starting date of women's volleyball.

[Proposal No. 114 (Page A-127) was approved by Division I.]

Local Sports Clubs

Kay Don (California State University, Long Beach): On behalf of the Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move Proposal No. 115.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation will eliminate a gap in the existing legislation concerning the involvement of basketball coaching staff members and local basketball activities. Current legislation prohibits basketball coaches from being involved with AAU teams. But Bylaw 13.12.2.4 currently would allow such activities if it was a local sports club.

It was the clear intent when the previous legislation was enacted to prohibit coaching staff members from being involved in local and area teams, but other applicable language was not amended. This legislation would not affect any other sport besides Divisions I and II men and women's basketball. The Interpretations Committee recently determined that if such legislation was enacted, the restrictions would not apply to other institutional staff members.

I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 115 (Page A-128) was approved by Division I.]

Recruiting—Telephone Calls

Peter T. Dalis (University of California, Los Angeles): I move Proposal No. 116 on behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of this rule will allow coaches to contact prospects when they are not in the home community. Due to the necessity of travel, we believe that this proposal will have an impact on cost containment.

[Proposal No. 116 (Page A-128) was approved by Division I.]

Recruiting—Contacts

Constance Hurlbut (Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 119.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment simply will permit an institution that does not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent or one that is not using the letter in a specific sport the same contact with a prospective student-athlete who made a commitment, an acceptance of admission and/or financial aid, as is currently permitted with student-athletes who sign national letters.

The communication and the spirit between these two classifications of high-school seniors who have committed to their respective institutions is both unnecessary and unfair.

I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 119 (Page A-131) was approved by Division I, 162-141, four abstentions.]

Institutional Stationery

Karol A. Kahrs (University of Illinois, Champaign): I move Proposal No. 123.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think that when this was originally passed by the Convention a couple of years ago, the intent was cost reduction. As a member of the cost reduction committee, I tried to indicate then that I didn't really believe that this would save us money. In fact, it did not.

Institutions will buy paper in bulk with a watermark, which is not allowed in current legislation. It increases your cost appreciably as opposed to decreasing it.

I urge the Convention to support Proposal No. 123.

David Price (Pacific-10 Conference): The Legislative Review Committee asked the Convention to consider Proposal No. 123 with a view toward deregulation. The committee intends to bring forth at the 1994 Convention the deregulation package involving recruiting legislation.

When Proposal No. 123 originally was proposed, the Council voted to express its opposition. Our committee looked at this. We would include this type of proposal in the deregulation package. We asked the Council to reconsider its opposition and it graciously did so.

You therefore have before you a proposal that we believe to be intended toward deregulation and cost containment. We ask you to use this as a test case and send us the signal that you desire deregulation.

[Proposal No. 123 (Page A-133) was approved by Division I.]

Official Visit—Academic Transcript

Gerald M. Lage (Oklahoma State University): I would like to move Proposal No. 125.

[The motion was seconded.]

In regard to the academic objectives we have, we ask for an early evaluation of prospects. There are some cases where the high-school coach or counselor refuses or does not assist in getting the transcripts of prospects to our people in a timely manner.

This proposal is a tool in getting that transcript. The legislation simply says that a high school or college record must be available for the academic advisers and coaches to review it before the initial visit so that whatever evaluation the institution wishes to conduct can be made. The legislation is written so that the transcripts can be photocopies without the seal and be directly mailed by the administrative offices.

I encourage your support of this proposal

[Proposal No. 125 (Page A-136) was approved by Division I.]

Official Visit Prior to Early Signing Period

Amy Campbell (Princeton University): On behalf of the Ivy Group, I move Proposal No. 126.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation becomes effective August 1, 1993. This specifies that the student-athlete must present the ACT or SAT test score before taking the official visit in the fall. This proposal seeks to permit the equivalent of the PSAT or PACT score to meet that requirement.

On the advice of secondary school counselors and college admissions officers, many student-athletes do not take the SAT or the ACT until the fall of their senior year, after the early National Letter of Intent signing date. Including the PSAT and the PACT, ordinarily taken in the junior year, would avoid interfering with the normal academic testing schedules of students by assuring that only prospective student-athletes who were qualifiers will be able to take early official visits.

I urge your support of No. 126.

R. Dale Smith (Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference): Available test data indicate that this proposal risks the eligibility of

borderline students and will not deliver the admissions benefit as advertised. Specifically, it will exclude approximately 25 percent of the students scoring 70 on the PSAT as juniors who will not score 700 or above on the SAT as seniors. Accepting these projected scores provides a false sense of security and procrastination in taking the actual tests and later haunts both borderline prospects and the recruiting institutions. In spite of this risk, this proposal would be worthy of consideration if it corrected the situation where NCAA legislation was adverse to prospects who missed opportunities.

This is not the case. College boards studies show that those who take the SAT in the spring of their junior year and again in the fall of their senior year showed no significant improvement. The college board data indicate no particular difference in the accuracy of predicting collegiate academic performance between the following admissions policies: the highest score from single-test data; the highest combined subscores for multiple tests and the most recent score, and the average of all scores or a weighted average.

Thus, I would conclude that the current legislation is the best policy for everyone. I urge you to oppose this proposal.

Nicholas D. Constan Jr. (University of Pennsylvania): We are not talking about dropping the significance of the 700-qualifiers board. But we are talking about, as the person who introduced the legislation said, allowing someone to take a test in the normal testing sequence that will give the likelihood of producing a 700 or above score.

I therefore urge you to support this because it really does come to us on the advice of the secondary school people who deal with these kinds of things all the time.

[Proposal No. 126 (Page A-136) was approved by Division I.]

Summer Basketball Camp Certification—Division I

Kay Don (California State University, Long Beach): On behalf of the Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 127.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ms. Don: I also would like to move Proposal No. 127-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation requires that Division I basketball coaching staff members attend only institutional camps per Bylaw 13.13 1.1 and noninstitutional camps that are certified by the NCAA.

There has been a proliferation of summer basketball camps. Until the recent beginning of the American Basketball Camp Association, no real standards existed among the institutional camps. Operators of some basketball camps contain "flesh peddlers" and ultimately encourage prospects to attend certain NCAA institutions. This proposal details certain minimum standards for certification of these camps. With the adoption of this legislation, NCAA coaching staff members would not attend noncertified, noninstitutional camps. As a result, it is believed that the desire of the prospect to attend a noncertified camp would decrease.

The specific criteria in this proposal is the first stage in this certification process. The NCAA Recruiting Committee not only has re-

ceived input from the National Association of Basketball Coaches and the Women's Basketball Coaches Association, but also the American Basketball Camp Association. It is envisioned that through further communications, additional criteria may be adopted in consultation with the NABC. The certification process would include the completion of a form by the camp operator in the spring before the camp begins that includes the general outline of how the criteria would be implemented.

After the completion of the camp, specific information will be provided by the camp operator that ensures that the criteria have been implemented. Revisions were made in the initial proposal to ensure that the criteria for noninstitutional camps were similar to those for institutional camps.

I encourage your support for this initial step toward uniformity and sanity in this area.

[Proposal No. 127-1 (Page A-139) was approved by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 127 (Page A-137) was approved by Division I, as amended by No. 127-1.]

Division I Membership Requirements—Financial Aid

Douglas S. Hobbs (University of California, Los Angeles): I move adoption of Proposal No. 135.

[The motion was seconded.]

Theodore L. Hullar (University of California, Davis): It is my pleasure to speak to this item. We believe this amendment to the bylaws is appropriate for a program such as ours. We currently are Division II, and we have a nonscholarship program. Our program has been successful in Division II competition and we also are successful in various competitions with Division I programs. We wish to remain a qualified program and we believe we can do so.

Let me speak to this in the following way. If you will refer to the text on Page 152 of the Official Notice, there are several items that stand out. This legislation will permit a Division I institution that is philosophically supportive of nonscholarship athletics programs to do so without meeting the minimum financial requirements. At the present time, Division I programs with those characteristics are permitted to remain without athletics scholarships. Those of us who are not presently in Division I but for a variety of reasons believe that we should be Division I are precluded from this opportunity. We think this is a defect in the legislation and believe it is appropriate for the NCAA to rectify that defect. This would provide institutions like ours to maintain a broad-based program without scholarships and provide another option for schools to compete in Division I and contain costs.

Let me speak more specifically to our situation to give you a sense of why we proposed this. We have always been a nonscholarship program. We have always worked hard to be very competitive. In the letter I sent to President Sweet, I noted that in 1992 we had 16 teams place nationally in Division II, one of which was a national champion, one of which placed second and one of which placed third. In the last several years, we have been in the Division II football playoffs and in 1982 advanced to the championship game.

We have a broad-based program and we pride ourselves on retaining it. We have 20 programs currently in intercollegiate athletics—11 men's and nine women's—and 34 club sports programs. We have a broad-based program strongly oriented toward gender equity. It is broad participation. Our athletes are such that we wish to provide to them the optimum, competitive opportunities. We believe that only can be done at Division I given our situation in Division II. We believe in cost containment, broad-based participation and gender equity. We have all of these.

If we are required to meet the scholarship and minimum financial aid requirements, we simply will not have as much cost containment, and broad-based participation or be as oriented to gender equity as we presently are. As I noted at the outset, we believe that it is certainly appropriate for the University of California at Davis. We believe it is likely to be appropriate for other programs and that this proposal would provide suitable options for them.

[Proposal No. 135 (Page A-148) was defeated by Division I.]

Sports Sponsorship—Division I

Kathy Clark (University of Idaho): I move adoption of Proposal No. 136.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would allow institutions to sponsor a minimum of six male or mixed teams and eight all-female teams—a total of 14 sports programs—or a minimum of seven male or mixed teams, and seven female teams—also a total of 14 sports programs—as alternate means to meet the Division I sports sponsorship requirements in Bylaw 20.9.3.

We are all facing an atmosphere of campus concerns relating to gender equity, fiscal responsibility, and Division I minimum sports sponsorship requirements. Proposal No. 136 provides timely, permissive legislation to allow institutional flexibility in making fiscally sound and yet aggressive steps for gender equity in the mandated Division I sports sponsorship requirements that are coming into effect next year. It is our understanding that the effective date of August 1, 1994, would be similarly interpreted as the new "seven and seven" requirement in Bylaw 20.9.3. In order to be in a position to certify compliance with Bylaw 20.9.3 as of September 1, 1994, the institution would need to sponsor the minimum number of programs during the 1993-94 academic year.

This legislation is straightforward, permissive and fiscally sound. It would provide a wealth of flexibility as institutions address the complex issue of gender equity and Division I sports sponsorship in the face of ever-present educational economic realities.

I urge your support of Proposal No. 136.

R. Daniel Beebe (Ohio Valley Conference): I request your support of No. 136.

Although we understand that this type of issue currently is under study by the Gender-Equity Task Force the adoption of this legislation is needed now for those institutions that are in the process of starting sports to meet the 1993-94 Division I sports sponsorship requirements. No. 136 assists schools like those in the Ohio Valley

Conference with football programs offer more opportunities to female and better balance the total athletics participation opportunities for each gender.

I urge you to consider the immediate needs of many of our institutions and support No. 136.

[Proposal No. 136 (Page A-149) was approved by Division I.]

Sports Sponsorship—Indoor and Outdoor Track

Merrily Dean Baker (Michigan State University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 137.

[The motion was seconded.]

The rationale is very explanatory, but I will add one quick note.

Contrary to the concerns expressed by some, we do not believe this would have any negative impact on indoor track. In fact, it would help institutions move toward their goal of achieving gender equity.

Carl C. James (Big Eight Conference): In the spirit of Resolutions Nos. 57 and 58, which were passed yesterday with a 99 percent "yes" vote and recognizing Commissioner Delany's plea in the Division I-A meeting this morning to let his committee come forth with a recommendation on a similar issue, I move that Proposal No. 137 be referred to the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics to be considered along with other such proposals.

[The motion was seconded.]

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I think it is inappropriate to isolate track and field at this time of vast examination of the issues of equity and costs in this Association. Although there may come a time when even the championships or the number of sports may be considered, I think this is an inappropriate time, and I recommend that we refer it.

[Proposal No. 137 (Page A-150) was referred by Division I to the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics.]

Athletics Housing

Betsy East (Cornell University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 143.

[The motion was seconded.]

NCAA legislation that becomes effective in 1996 prohibits athletics dormitories. As currently defined, any dormitory floor, hall or wing on which more than 50 percent of the residents are athletes is defined as an athletics dormitory.

While necessary to provide for clear enforcement, the narrow definition of athletics dormitory means that an institution with a high percentage of student-athletes in which athletes are assigned housing by the same procedure that students generally are, may inadvertently violate this policy. This proposal will leave the underlying rule in place but provide relief for such institutions if it can prove that residence patterns are not the result of athletics-based assignments.

Dutch Baughman (Oregon State University): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, we would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 143.

At the present time, our institutions are not permitted to operate

athletics dormitory blocks. If Proposal No. 143 is adopted, an institution will be permitted to create athletics dorms or blocks for student-athletes provided the student nonathlete group is permitted to establish a special block or group in a dormitory. The criteria to establish student nonathlete housing blocks could be tough or very lenient. We believe our student-athletes are best served by experiencing the mainstream of student life. Adoption of Proposition No. 143 will allow an institution intending to establish an athletics dormitory block an easy and conspicuous way of doing it.

We urge defeat of Proposal No. 143

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): I understand that the previous speakers have said this is to establish a dormitory on our campuses for the first time. The legislation is written so that the group seeking to establish a special dormitory as an athletics group absolutely could not do so because it would require the housing process in question to be one that does not consider athletics.

It is designed solely so that regular institutional procedures that assign students by lot or by seniority, or by any other mutual formula, and which happen to wind up with assigned patterns in which 50 percent or more of the people in that particular unit are athletes, are not automatically considered athletics dormitories simply because of the operation of the mutual system on a group of students who turn out to be athletes. This is almost certain to happen at an institution where a large percentage of the student body is athletes. They are known at our institutions.

We believe that this proposal allows all of us to continue to eliminate and restrain athletics dormitories without being an accidental or unintentional violator within the spirit and letter of the NCAA book.

Mr. Baughman: We understand that. We believe that it may be very easy for a student nonathlete organization to request a special block assignment of dormitories. If that was the case, that would open the door perhaps for athletics teams or the athletics department to do the same.

Mr. Orleans: If your intent is to vote whether we have confidence in ourselves to administer our housing programs, I think we should vote confidence in ourselves and pass this proposal.

[Proposal No. 143 (Page A-153) was approved by Division I.]

Division I Championships Eligibility

Doris R. Soladay (Syracuse University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 154.
[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit a Division I institution that conducts a Division II or III football program, but must reclassify its football program in Division I for the 1993-94 academic year in accordance with Bylaw 20.4.1.1, to be eligible to participate immediately in the Division I-AA championship without satisfying the two-year conformity period set forth in Bylaw 18.4.2.2-(b).

Currently, Bylaw 18.4.2.2-(b) specifies that a Division I institution is not eligible to compete in a Division I championship unless the institution has operated for a period of two years in conformity with

the Division I freshman and transfer eligibility requirements of practice, competition and financial aid. A Division I institution that currently conducts a Division II or III football program, but must reclassify its football program in Division I for the 1993-94 academic year per Bylaw 20.4.1.1, may have difficulty meeting these requirements in order to participate in the 1993 and 1994 Division I-AA Football Championships. The provisions of Bylaw 18.4.2.2 governing eligibility should not prevent an institution that is forced by legislation to reclassify its football program in Division I from participating immediately in the Division I-AA Football Championships.

The Executive Committee has also expressed its support for the adoption of this proposal. I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 154.

[Proposal No. 154 (Page A-162) was approved by Division I.]

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

[Note: The slate for Division I representatives to the Council was presented and approved.]

[The Division I business session was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.]

NCAA Honors Dinner

Wednesday Evening, January 13, 1993

President Sweet: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the Association's 28th annual honors dinner. There has been a change in tonight's program. Bernard Shaw of the Cable News Network has had to cancel his appearance because of events in the Persian Gulf.

Bernard Shaw (by videotape): My, my, never has so much talent gathered around dinner tables since Thomas Jefferson dined alone.

Ladies and gentlemen, and President Sweet, thank you very much. I am truly sorry, CNN is truly sorry and CNN President Thomas Johnson is sorry that I cannot be with you tonight. This has been a very hectic, hellaciously hectic day. It is a hectic night and it is going to continue.

We have reports that the strikes have been completed. All the United States, French and British aircraft have returned safely. We have heard from the government of Saddam Hussein, who ensued battle, that another idiotic battle has begun. Whether that is true, we just don't know. The Capitol is very much alive here in Washington. I had hoped to be with you from the head table wearing a black tie and a nice dinner jacket. I had hoped to be with you during the cocktail hour that ended a short while ago, to break bread with you and also to honor the talented 12 men and women and Secretary Lamar Alexander.

As you know, news contingencies do have a way of disrupting our lives. That is the case with the strike in the gulf today. It occurs to me that two years ago this coming Saturday I was in Baghdad when the war broke out.

I respect my colleagues in Baghdad along with the rest of the world press corps. I am a journalist, I am a fellow American, but we are not all serious newspeople. There are other things that matter in life—the development of one's mind, the development of one's body, the adherence to goals and striving and achieving those goals. That is what this gathering is about tonight in this huge hotel in Dallas, and I salute all of you.

I ask you to forgive us for not being able to complete what we had committed to do. You do have me on tape, you do have me reporting the feats and accomplishments of these fine men and women. I hope that will be acceptable for now. I will tell you one thing, I will make amends. At some point in coming years, I hope to be your master of ceremonies rather than appear on videotape. I salute you. God bless, thank you very much. Good night. (Applause)

President Sweet: I know we appreciate Bernard's extra efforts to send us his message tonight. We hope for a peaceful resolution to this latest crisis and the safe return of our military personnel. It is a

sobering thought that some of the men and women who are on alert halfway around the world were competing on our playing fields just a few months ago. Tonight when we celebrate those who have worn the uniform of the student-athlete, let's also pray for the safe return of those wearing the uniform of our armed forces. At this time, please rise for the invocation.

INVOCATION

Brother Thomas J. Scanlan (Manhattan College): Let us remember that we are in the holy presence of God.

God, you are the giver of all intellectual and athletics gifts. You ask only that we develop these talents to the fullest and use them to benefit all men and women with whom we share this planet. We ask you to forgive us those times when we ask you to join our team against our opponents, rather than just let you watch the game and enjoy seeing everyone use their talents as best they can. We ask you to send your spirit to guide our deliberations at this Convention and to enable us to judge all in the light of how they affect the student-athletes whom we serve. We ask you to bless our honorees and all those gathered here. Renew in us our dedication to excellence in academics and in athletics, and to all the values espoused by the National Collegiate Athletic Association. We ask you to bless and protect those in our military and to bring peace and justice to our world. Lastly, we ask you to bless the food and drink and fellowship we share on this special occasion and to watch over those less fortunate than us. Amen.

SPECIAL INTRODUCTIONS

President Sweet: Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I realize some of you have not completed your meals, but we have a long agenda and a short time period in which to complete our program. Please continue to enjoy your meal while I make some preliminary remarks and introductions, after which I will present our honored guests to you.

I have had the opportunity to represent this Association on a number of occasions and in a variety of environments during the past two years while serving as your president. Among those many opportunities that have provided me great pleasure is my participation in the honors program. This event gains more prestige each year. The honors dinner annually permits us to reflect on the positive values of intercollegiate athletics within the mission of higher education that has been established on each of our campuses. We take great pride that the student-athletes who participate in intercollegiate athletics often must meet higher standards to participate in these programs than do their peers who are active in other extracurricular activities administered on our campuses.

These 12 individuals to be honored tonight represent the very best products of our intercollegiate athletics programs. We salute their accomplishments. We also take tremendous pride in the successes of current and former student-athletes from each of our individual campuses who have become role models in the environments in which

they have competed and in which they serve. It is these successes that provide us the encouragement and the will to continue our quest to create the best possible athletics opportunities for those students in generations to come who wish to participate in our programs.

The individuals whom we salute are representative of the many men and women who annually combine intellectual and physical abilities along with leadership qualities to epitomize the student-athlete concepts that many of us have attempted to nurture on our respective campuses. In addition to recognizing the College Athletics Top XII and the Theodore Roosevelt Award winner this evening, we welcome two former NCAA champions who won gold medals for the United States in the Summer Olympic Games.

At this time, I wish to introduce individuals sharing the dais who will not be acknowledged later in our program.

On my right is our secretary-treasurer, who has represented you well in a number of demanding activities during the past year. It is my pleasure to introduce to you a new Texan, Mr. B. J. Skelton, who is the new director of athletics at the University of Texas at Arlington. (Applause)

I now wish to present the president of the United States Olympic Committee, Dr. Leroy Walker, who is a member of the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics and a friend of many years. (Applause)

I have had many assignments during my tenure with the NCAA. None was more rewarding than six years ago when I had an opportunity to serve on the search committee for the new executive director of the NCAA. He has more than met our expectations. It is with particular pride that I have the opportunity to present the executive director of the NCAA, Dick Schultz. (Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, it now is my pleasure to introduce our master of ceremonies. Jack Davis is the chair of the NCAA Honors Committee, which is responsible for selecting our honorees and coordinating this dinner. He is a former NCAA president. Tonight he brings new meaning to the responsibilities of being a committee chair. Jack, thank you. (Applause)

SPECIAL RECOGNITION

John R. Davis (Oregon State University): President Sweet, Mr. secretary, honorees and guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege for me to collaborate with Bernard Shaw in tonight's honors dinner, but I believe we can appreciate that the current activities in the gulf prevent him from being with us. However, Mr. Shaw already had prepared tape-overs, so you will notice that he will be with us in his familiar voice when you see the biographies of each of our honorees. I would never have thought that I would have anything in common with Saddam Hussein, but we both got a big surprise today. I am sure that my evening will be more enjoyable than his. (Laughter)

Tonight we celebrate one of the nation's unique and highly valued treasures, mutually supportive roles of higher education and intercollegiate athletics. We honor some of the most outstanding successes

of this system tonight, a real tribute to the American system of higher education. In addition, we wish to focus our attention to another group of athletes from member institutions who represented our country in the Olympic Games.

Intercollegiate athletics tends to reflect the philosophy and the qualities of a given institution. Conversely, the representation and public support for higher education reflect the qualities of its athletics program, partly because of media interest and coverage, but mainly because student-athletes are our students; coaches and athletics directors are our faculties. Therefore, whenever these students or staffs exhibit those qualities of dedication, intelligence and leadership that are fostered in our institutions of higher education, we can indeed take great pleasure, pride and appreciation for our educational system. The NCAA represents common goals of higher education and athletics more than any other organization. NCAA member institutions truly have exercised leadership in drug-abuse prevention, academic integrity, equal opportunity and gender equity, but more than anything else, the worth of the individual, not just as an athlete, but as a human being with potential for lifelong achievements. Let us now meet some of those who have achieved that potential and whom we honor tonight. Let's enjoy being a part of their successes. Let's reflect on the values of our American system of higher education and on ours and their responsibility to continue the good work.

I would like to call your attention to your program to review the lists of student-athletes who have been named Walter Byers Scholars and those who have received NCAA postgraduate scholarships during the past year. The NCAA's postgraduate scholarship program began in 1964. Since that time, the Association has invested more than \$4 million in postgraduate scholarships to more than 2,300 student-athletes. We congratulate each of these outstanding student-athletes and the institutions that they represent.

Now, to salute our NCAA Olympians. The NCAA traditionally has provided the leadership, training and coaching for our nation's major amateur programs. This fact is proven every four years in the Olympics, but it is recognized annually in international competition that is held at home and abroad. The 1992 Summer Games in Barcelona were no exception.

Bernard M. Shaw (by videotape): The United States won 108 medals, its third-highest total ever. In sports that are sponsored by the NCAA, the United States finished second in the final standings by winning 31 gold medals, 23 silver medals and 27 bronze medals. Athletes who participated in track and field and swimming were responsible for much of our nation's success. These two sports alone would have placed the United States fourth in total medals won and fourth in first-place performances.

Each of us has our own special memories of the games. For some, it could have been Kevin Young's world-record time in the 400-meter hurdles. For others, Nicole Haislett winning three gold swimming medals; Carl Lewis repeating his dominance in the long jump and running on the world-record 4 x 100-meter relay team, or the "Dream Team," the greatest basketball team in history. Although all

NCAA medal winners are listed in your program, please join me in a special salute to those who won the gold. (Applause)

Mr. Davis: It now is my pleasure to introduce two former NCAA champions who were gold-medal winners at Barcelona. They represent all current and former athletes who participated in NCAA competition and in the 1992 Olympics. Each will receive an NCAA award from Dr. Walker.

Mr. Shaw: Gail Devers won the NCAA championship in the 100-meter dash in 1988 for UCLA. She overcame Graves' disease as a child to become a world-class athlete. Gail earned the description as the world's fastest woman by winning the 100 meters in Barcelona.

Mr. Davis: Ladies and gentlemen, Gail Devers, UCLA. (Applause)

Mr. Shaw: Melvin Stewart twice won the 200-meter butterfly in the NCAA championships for the University of Tennessee. He established an Olympic record in his specialty and was a member of the 4 x 100-medley relay team that set a world record in the preliminary swim.

Mr. Davis: Ladies and gentlemen, Melvin Stewart, the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. (Applause)

I invite Gail Devers to respond on behalf of all NCAA student-athletes who participated in the Olympics.

Gail Devers (University of California, Los Angeles): Thank you. First of all, I would like to thank the NCAA for inviting us. It is a great honor to be here. I also thank the NCAA for its continued support of student-athletes everywhere. My biggest thrill in going to UCLA was to be a part of a team and also to get an education from, in my opinion, the finest institution in this nation. I am very thankful to have received a scholarship. Had it not been for the efforts of UCLA and the NCAA, it would have been impossible for my parents to send me to college, and I wonder where I would be today. I am the type of person that takes full advantage of every opportunity that is given to me. Knowing that I had the chance to get a great education, I studied hard in the classroom and hard on the track to learn all that I could from my professors and from my coach so that I could pursue my goals and my dreams athletically and academically.

I think we, as student-athletes, feel very fortunate to have the NCAA on our side. I know for a fact that the NCAA cares about us not only as athletes but as people in general, and wants us to become the best that we can be. The NCAA goes out of its way to make those things happen. For me, UCLA has become an extension of my family. Dr. Judith Holland is not just the athletics director, she has become a friend and counselor; even more at times I remember in our first conversations she told me "Gail, you will graduate from this school." That meant a lot to me because it let me know she wasn't just concerned about me as an athlete. She was there to support me and my school was there to support me in all my endeavors. The lessons that I have learned from my college career have stayed with me and are something that I definitely will share with others because they helped to shape me into the person that I am today. They made me successful not only athletically but in life.

Speaking on behalf of all NCAA Olympians, past, present and fu-

ture, I would like to say thank you to the NCAA from the bottom of our hearts for helping to make our dream come true. Thank you, and God bless you. (Applause)

Mr. Davis: I have to read from the script and she does it ad lib so well. (Laughter)

Thank you both for being with us. Gail tells me she is going to go for the 1996 Olympics in Atlanta, so we wish her well. (Applause)

The College Athletics Top XII permits the Association to honor six outstanding student-athletes from the preceding year and six former letter-winners who have distinguished themselves in their chosen profession on their silver anniversary as college graduates. The criteria for these awards are listed in your program. I take great pleasure in introducing the current student-athletes to you. A video of each honoree may be seen on the screens as Mr. Shaw presents the biographical information.

Michael Compton, West Virginia University, Football.

A number of collegiate athletes maintain roles on the playing field that are only a part of their everyday lives. Many also make significant contributions to their campus and community environments and earn the respect of their peers in the classroom.

Mr. Shaw: Mike Compton certainly has been one of the role models for intercollegiate athletics at West Virginia University. Mike just completed an outstanding undergraduate career, earning academic and consensus all-American honors. The team captain earned all-Big East Conference honors as a center and played in the Blue-Gray game. By the way, if he looks a little sleepy to you, he has been in Hawaii preparing for Saturday's Hula Bowl game and arrived this morning in Dallas with his wife.

Mike was named the top student in the school of physical education, earning a 3.500 grade-point average while placing academic emphasis on family and child-care activities and issues. He was presented the Ideal Mountaineer Award for excellence in attitude, leadership and citizenship. Mike was the keynote speaker at the 1992 West Virginia American Legion Boys' State retreat, is involved in the "Books are Cool" outreach program in cooperation with the West Virginia Education Fund and devotes much of his time working with disabled and special-needs children at West Virginia Children's Hospital.

Mr. Davis: Mike will receive his award from Ed Pastilong, the athletics director of West Virginia University.

Carlton P. Gray, University of California, Los Angeles, Football.

Like Mike Compton, Carlton Gray is experiencing the Hawaii-Dallas jet lag that has resulted from his preparation for Saturday's Hula Bowl.

Mr. Shaw: Carlton, quite simply, is considered the outstanding defensive back in the nation. He has been chosen for every all-America team selected this year.

A four-year starter at UCLA, Carlton twice earned all-Pacific-10 Conference honors and ranks second in career interceptions with 15. He set a UCLA record with 10 as a junior. A National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame and NCAA postgraduate scholar-athlete,

Carlton has compiled a 3.400 grade-point average majoring in communications studies, which is one of UCLA's most demanding and competitive academic disciplines. National prominence, however, has been no stranger to Carlton's family. He hopes to mirror the success of his grandfather, Benjamin Hooks, the longtime leader of the NAACP.

Carlton frequently speaks to young people about the advantages of staying in school, avoiding gangs and saying no to drugs. He is a UCLA community outreach leader and a feed-the-homeless volunteer, devotes time to visiting hospitals and is active in minority affairs on campus.

Mr. Davis: Carlton will receive his award from Peter T. Dalis, director of athletics of the University of California, Los Angeles.

Clyston "Steve" Holman, Georgetown University, Cross Country/Track and Field.

To say that Steve Holman just completed a busy 1992 calendar year would be quite the understatement.

Mr. Shaw: He strengthened his status as a world-class athlete by participating in the Olympics and complemented those efforts when he pursued new academic challenges by enrolling in the Georgetown law school.

An 11-time all-American, Steve capped his collegiate career by winning the NCAA championship in the 1,500-meter run. He also placed fifth in the event at the Olympic Games in Barcelona. A seven-time Big East Conference champion, Steve established one conference and three Georgetown records during his career.

Steve also excelled academically. He earned a 3.400 grade-point average in English and was Georgetown's most outstanding student-athlete for 1992. He was the Big East scholar-athlete of the year, an academic all-American and was named to the Big East postgraduate scholarship team. Steve was a volunteer for community outreach programs and was a writer for the campus publication for African-American students.

Mr. Davis: Steve will receive his award from Francis X. Rienzo, the athletics director of Georgetown University.

Melissa A. Marlowe, University of Utah, Gymnastics.

If you compiled a list of gymnastic achievements and checked it very carefully, it is likely Missy Marlowe could truthfully place a check mark by most everything on the ledger with her success at the University of Utah.

Mr. Shaw: Missy captured a record five individual NCAA championships, including the titles in four of the 1992 individual competitions—all-around, balance beam, uneven bars and floor exercise. She is the only collegiate gymnast to score a perfect 10 on every apparatus. No one else has scored a 10 in more than two events. The 12-time all-American received the AAU Senior Award as the nation's top senior gymnast and led Utah to team titles in 1990 and 1992. She also won a gold medal on uneven bars for the winning U.S. team in the Pan American Games. She also participated in the 1988 Olympics.

An exercise and sports sciences graduate who established a 3.070 grade-point average, Missy spent last summer as an athlete's repre-

sentative for the 1992 Olympic gymnastics selection committee. She was a statewide speaker concerning drug awareness and goal settings to youth groups and a volunteer for Special Olympics, the Multiple Sclerosis Society and the American Lung Association.

Mr. Davis: Missy will receive her award from Dr. Arthur K. Smith, president of the University of Utah.

Susan K. Robinson, Pennsylvania State University, Basketball.

We have noted that Mike Compton and Carlton Gray are experiencing jet lag, but they are mere commuters compared to our next honoree. She is playing professional basketball in Japan.

Mr. Shaw: Susan Robinson was named the national basketball player of the year at Pennsylvania State University last year and received the prestigious Margaret Wade Trophy. The consensus all-American established 20 records for the Nittany Lions and led the team in scoring each of her four seasons, averaging 18.5 points per game. She scored in double figures in 91 consecutive games, completed 90.7 percent of her career free throws and had more than 1,000 rebounds.

An academic all-American who earned a 3.560 grade-point average majoring in exercise and sports sciences, Susan was awarded postgraduate scholarships by both the NCAA and the Women's Basketball Coaches Association. Susan was elected to Golden Key and volunteered much of her time speaking to young people about the value of hard work and saying no to drugs. She was a Big Sister and regularly visited elementary schools to read to students and emphasize the value of reading.

Mr. Davis: Susan will receive her award from Dr. Joab L. Thomas, President of Pennsylvania State University.

Gino Toretta, University of Miami (Florida), Football.

When Gino Toretta was a high-school football player, he informed his mother that one day he would win the Heisman Trophy. That prediction came true in December when the University of Miami consensus all-American quarterback was presented college football's most prominent award.

Mr. Shaw: But while the Heisman Trophy recognizes individual achievement, football remains a team sport. Few teams have exemplified this fact better than the Hurricanes. Gino has led Miami to a national championship and the Hurricanes have won 26 of the 28 games that he has started. And with all of the great quarterbacks who have preceded him at Miami—Heisman-winner Vinny Testaverde, Jim Kelly, Bernie Kosar, Steve Walsh and Craig Erickson—it is Gino who has established career records for pass completions, yards, touchdowns and total offense. He once threw 144 consecutive passes without an interception and had three 400-yard-plus passing games with a best of 485 yards against San Diego State.

Currently enrolled as a graduate student, Gino established a 3.400 grade-point average earning a degree in business administration. In addition to the Heisman, Gino has received the Davy O'Brien Award as the nation's top quarterback, the Maxwell Outstanding Player Award and twice was the Big East Conference player of the year. Gino is a volunteer in the Miami Metro-Dade County police depart-

ment's "Join a Team, Not a Gang" program as well as in a drug abuse resistance education program. He is a frequent speaker at elementary schools and a frequent visitor to Charter Hospital of Miami.

Mr. Davis: Gino will receive his award from David L. Maggard, director of athletics at the University of Miami (Florida).

Mike Compton will respond on behalf of the current student-athletes.

Michael Compton (West Virginia University): Thank you. First of all, I am wondering how I got voted to do this. I wrote a few things down because I probably will forget. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen and Mr. Secretary. I got that part right. (Laughter) Seriously, it is a great honor to be here tonight and to be able to speak on behalf of the other five honorees. The other five athletes and I will not be playing sports for the rest of our lives, but when sports are over, we will have the knowledge and the wisdom that our education has given us over the past four or five years. No one can ever take that away from us. I am sure that the other athletes will agree with me. The six honorees here tonight represent hundreds of student-athletes across this country who dedicate themselves not only to their sport but more importantly to their academics and being successful in life.

On behalf of the honorees, I would like to thank the NCAA and the universities for having faith in us and giving us a chance and the opportunity to participate in intercollegiate athletics and obtain a college degree. The achievements obtained by these men and women were brought on because of dedication, commitment and the desire to be at the head of their class. Our achievements also continue off the field and out of the classroom in the community by helping others such as children in hospitals. The lessons we have learned throughout our college experience will be with us throughout our lives. It will help us become successful in a real game—the game of life. It is a great honor and privilege for me to be here tonight, and I wish the other five student-athletes good luck in their future endeavors. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Davis: Thank you, Mike. We wanted to prove to the world that offensive linemen and centers can be thoughtful and articulate. (Laughter)

Our congratulations and best wishes to each of the honorees.

Now we salute the Silver Anniversary honorees.

Richard P. Anderson, University of Colorado, Boulder, Football.

Dick Anderson expected perfection on the football field, and we would agree that that expectation has followed him in his successful business career.

Mr. Shaw: Dick earned all-American honors on the football field at the University of Colorado, establishing a career-interceptions record, and in the classroom, where he graduated with a degree in business. After leading the Buffaloes to a 9-2 record and a win in the Bluebonnet Bowl, the three-year starter was drafted in the third round by Miami. He enjoyed a 10-year playing career that was highlighted by one of the most impressive achievements in professional football—a perfect 17-0 season in 1972. Miami won two Super Bowls.

He was named to three Pro Bowl teams and was the 1973 defensive player of the year after leading the NFL with eight interceptions.

He served briefly in the Florida State Senate after his retirement from football. But today Dick presides over a cellular phone and paging company and an insurance agency. He is chair of the Miami Project to cure paralysis, where he oversees a \$6 million budget and a staff of 100 employees at the University of Miami Medical School. Dick is treasurer of the 200 Club of Miami, which raises money for families of slain policemen and firefighters. A member of the Colorado Sports Hall of Fame, Dick is a member of the Orange Bowl Committee and is one of 12 former players on the NFL Player Advancement Council.

Mr. Davis: Dick will receive his award from Dr. Judith Albino, president of the University of Colorado, Boulder.

Robert D. Johnson, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Football.

While it is a rarity for an offensive lineman to score a touchdown, it is even more uncommon for any athlete to be described in sports slang as a team's franchise player.

Mr. Shaw: Bob Johnson did earn this distinction, both literally and figuratively, during his outstanding football career.

A two-time all-American center at Tennessee, Bob anchored the 1967 SEC championship team that finished No. 2 in the nation and played in the Orange Bowl. He played in the Senior Bowl, the All-American Bowl, the college all-star game and the 1966 Gator Bowl. He then was the first draft selection of the expansion Cincinnati Bengals and the third pick overall in the 1968 NFL draft. And for a brief moment, he was the franchise since he was the only player on the entire roster. Bob played professional football for 12 years, was the team captain and is the only Bengals player to have his jersey retired.

A member of the all-time SEC team, the National Football Foundation scholar-athlete earned academic all-American honors in 1967, establishing a B-plus average in industrial engineering. He was selected to Omicron Delta Kappa and named a "Torchbearer" by his graduating class. Today, Bob is president of a rapidly growing adhesives firm in his hometown of Cincinnati. He is an elder in the Presbyterian church and has spent time as the Ohio chair of the American Cancer Society and as a board member of the local Boy Scouts of America. He is a member of the College Football Hall of Fame.

Mr. Davis: Bob will receive his award from Dr. Joe Johnson, president of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Donna A. Lopiano, Southern Connecticut State University, Field Hockey, Volleyball, Basketball and Badminton.

Many of you are familiar with the professional achievements of Donna Lopiano.

Mr. Shaw: Named executive director of the Women's Sports Foundation less than a year ago, Donna previously was director of women's athletics at the University of Texas at Austin, where she was a national leader in the development of women's intercollegiate sports. But Donna was once herself a force on the playing fields. She earned letters at Southern Connecticut State University in field

hockey, volleyball, basketball and badminton. Although she did not play softball collegiately, Donna was one of the game's great fast-pitch players and was inducted into the National Softball Hall of Fame.

Donna majored in health and physical education and earned her master's and doctorate degrees from the University of Southern California. While at Texas from 1975 until 1992, Donna developed one of the strongest women's college sports program in the country. The Longhorns won 18 national championships in six different sports and 59 Southwest Conference championships.

Donna has served on numerous NCAA committees, is a past president of the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women and was a Women's Sports Foundation trustee for six years. She has been inducted into the Southern Connecticut State University and Texas Women's Halls of Fame.

Mr. Davis: Donna will receive her award from Darryl Rogers, director of athletics at Southern Connecticut State University.

Donald A. Schollander, Yale University, Swimming.

Don Schollander understood at an early age the sacrifices he and his family would have to make to achieve his athletics goal. He wanted to win an Olympic gold medal.

Mr. Shaw: So after his freshman year in high school, he moved from his Oregon hometown to southern California to train under the guidance of legendary swimming coach George Haines. This persistence and devotion paid off. At the 1964 Tokyo Summer Games, he became the first athlete since Jesse Owens to win four gold medals in one Olympiad.

When Don entered Yale University after that Olympics, his personal dedication to swimming became secondary to his drive to achieve academic excellence. The swim team did not notice, nor did the NCAA records book. Don led the Elis to a 40-1 record in dual-meet competition and a second-place finish in the NCAA championships. He set numerous NCAA, American and world records and returned to the 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games to capture a fifth gold and one silver medal.

After graduation, Don became an institutional stockbroker. Later he returned to Portland as vice-president of a start-up electronics company. Since 1975, he has concentrated his efforts in real estate development. Don is involved in a number of charitable organizations, including cystic fibrosis, the American Cancer Society and the Kerr Center for Handicapped Children. He served on the board of directors for the United States Olympic Committee and was a member of the President's Council on Physical Fitness Advisors.

Mr. Davis: Don will receive his award from Ed Woodsum, director of athletics at Yale University.

Stanley R. Smith, University of Southern California, Tennis.

Most people who follow tennis will have no problem remembering Stan Smith's career at the University of Southern California and as an active professional.

Mr. Shaw: After all, Stan was a three-time all-American who won the 1968 NCAA singles championship and teamed with partner Bob

Lutz to claim the 1967 and 1968 doubles crowns.

But his most significant legacy as a collegian is unique. Few of us are aware that this business finance major was responsible for creating the very first Big Brothers of America campus program when he was gaining recognition as one of the world's great tennis players.

Stan joined the professional tennis circuit after graduation and immediately laid claim as the No. 1-ranked tennis player in this country. He advanced to No. 1 in the world a mere three years later. Singles titles at the U.S. Open and Wimbledon paved the way for that honor. He participated on several Davis Cup squads and currently serves as director of coaches for the U.S. Tennis Association. He has authored various books on the sport, served as a contributing editor to Tennis Magazine and has written a syndicated tennis column.

Stan heads a design company that develops tennis facilities, is a frequent speaker for church and youth-athlete outreach programs at major tennis events, and helps teach and conduct youth clinics for the U.S. Tennis Association. He has been inducted into the College Tennis and University of Southern California Tennis Halls of Fame.

Mr. Davis: Stan will receive his award from Jim Dennis, senior vice-president for student affairs at the University of Southern California.

Wyomia Tyus, Tennessee State University, Track.

Throughout the decade of the 1950s, one female sprinter stood above the rest.

Mr. Shaw: She was and remains the only female ever to win gold medals in the 100 meters in consecutive Olympic Games. Much of the credit for her success belongs to Ed Temple, the legendary track coach at Tennessee State University who helped Wyomia Tyus realize her fame and potential. You see, Wyomia's forte in high school was basketball.

Although she was the top sprinter at her school in Griffin, Georgia, track was just a sideline. But coach Temple saw in Wyomia the same star qualities he had seen in two of his earlier pupils—Wilma Rudolph and Edith McGuire Duvall—each of whom also has received Silver Anniversary Awards from the NCAA. And like those great sprinters who preceded her at Tennessee State, Wyomia's reputation became world-class at the 1964 Tokyo Summer Olympic Games, where she won the 100 meters and was a member of the silver-medal 4 x 100-meter relay team. Four years later in Mexico City, Wyomia collected her second Olympic gold in the 100 meters, then anchored the victory in the 4 x 100-meter relays.

Wyomia has been recognized for her work as a human relations leader for the student-to-student integration program of the Los Angeles Unified School District and a career and development instructor for the United States Department of Labor and the National Football League Players Association. She is a member of no fewer than nine halls of fame, including the U.S. Olympic Hall of Fame. She has been a goodwill ambassador to Africa on behalf of the U.S. Department of State. She is active in community activities, the U.S. Olympic Committee and the Black Studies Center at UCLA. She also serves as chairperson and director of sports clinics for the Asthma

and Allergy Foundation of America.

Mr. Davis: Wyomia will receive her award from William Thomas, athletics director at Tennessee State University.

Responding on behalf of the Silver Anniversary honorees is Wyomia Tyus.

Wyomia Tyus (Tennessee State University): Thank you and good evening, ladies and gentlemen. It is with great pride and honor that I have been selected as one of the Silver Anniversary recipients and asked to speak on behalf of the other honorees—Richard, Robert, Donna, Don and Stan.

When I was asked if I would do the speech, I immediately said yes. Then I was told that I had to keep it to two minutes. I said to myself, they must have forgotten who they were talking to. Two minutes is a lifetime for a sprinter. (Laughter) We do everything by seconds. So for 172,800 seconds, two days for you non-sprinters, I have tried to think of things to say that each honoree on this podium would have liked to have said if they were in my shoes. There are a few things that I know they would have said and probably still are saying it.

It doesn't seem like 25 years. (Laughter) A quarter of a century? Has it been that long? I am sure there are days when we spring out of our bed, or try to spring out of the bed, that we know it has been 25 years. Yes, it has been that long, and there have been a lot of changes. Changes that truly enhanced the NCAA: a change that is very close and dear to me is a change in women's sports.

During my years of competition, there were very few colleges or universities—Tennessee State is the only one I can think of—that were giving any type of athletics scholarships or had any type of sports programs for women. The support and encouragement mainly came from our families. But now look at the changes. Wow! Almost every college and university has some type of athletics program for women. It is not just the changes in women's sports, but also the changes in men's sports.

All of us have gained from these changes, changes that make our athletes so much greater, not only on the athletics field but also in life. There are some things that never change. And that is what it took to be honored on this podium tonight. I call it the three D's: drive, determination and dedication. The drive it took to be the best that you can, to give that 110 percent; determined to accomplish your goal, not to give up if you don't reach your personal goal the first time. Try and try again. Not just on the athletics field, but also in life. Dedication to your higher power, true to yourself and to your sport. Dedicated to putting the long hours in on practice and also in school work to make a better you. Those things never change, only the names behind them.

So on behalf of all of us, we thank the NCAA for this great honor. We also thank our fans, our family and our friends. Again, thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Davis: Thank you, Wyomia. Our thanks and our gratitude to you and your outstanding colleagues for representing so well so many of our former student-athletes.

Now it is time to turn our attention to the focal point of each hon-

ors program, the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award—the highest honor the Association bestows on an individual. Your program includes pictures of past winners of this award, which recognizes a distinguished citizen who, having earned a varsity athletics award in college, has exemplified ideals and purposes to which college athletics programs and amateur sports competition are dedicated. It is a distinguished group, including former presidents and the current President of the United States, military leaders, pioneers in space and medicine. All truly have been worthy of this recognition.

Tonight's honoree is familiar with the NCAA honors dinner and its history in this ballroom. He received the Association's Silver Anniversary Award at the Convention's 22nd annual honors program at this hotel in 1987.

Mr. Shaw: Lamar Alexander's appointment as the secretary of education by President Bush in January of 1991 laid squarely in his lap the task of bettering America's education system. Education, of course, is a subject that always hits close to home. It involves a wide scope of complicated social issues, ranging from poverty and illiteracy to parental apathy. To spark the needed transformation of American education, the secretary set ambitious "National Education Goals" to be achieved by the year 2000. Included in those goals were a high-school graduation rate of 90 percent; top rankings for American students in science and mathematics; an entire population of literate adults possessing the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy, and schools free of drugs and violence that offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

The secretary carried solid credentials to Washington to direct our nation's highest education office. As a two-term governor of Tennessee, former chair of the National Governors' Association and President of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, he earned a national reputation as a pioneer in education reform. He initiated the \$12 billion Tennessee Better Schools Program, including a "career ladder" incentive pay plan for teachers and he toured nearly every school in his state. As chair of the National Governors' Association, he led a 50-state education survey, "Time for Results."

He was chosen by his fellow governors as one of the two most effective governors in the nation and later was honored by the Education Commission of the States for "distinguished national leadership in education." A Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Vanderbilt University, Secretary Alexander lettered two years in track and was editor of both the school newspaper and yearbook. He later became a law review editor at New York University.

During his nearly three-year tenure at the University of Tennessee, the secretary served as a member of the Knight Foundation Commission, a group studying in-depth the role that intercollegiate athletics plays in the academic community. Before his election as governor, he served on the board of Maryville College, and was active in Boy Scout work. He and his wife, Honey, joined with Bob Keeshan, television's "Captain Kangaroo" to found Corporate Child Care, Inc., which helps companies solve their employees' child-care problems.

Mr. Davis: Ladies and gentlemen, it is with great pleasure that I present to you The Honorable Lamar Alexander, from Vanderbilt University. (Applause)

The Honorable A. Lamar Alexander Jr. (Vanderbilt University): Thank you. Thank you, Jack Davis and Judith Sweet, Dick Schultz, distinguished ladies and gentlemen, scholar-athletes. My special thanks to my wife, Honey, and my sister, Jane, and other family members for being here.

I thought as I listened to all of this that I must have come further in the NCAA with less athletics ability than anyone in its history. Six years ago, I stood at this program with such persons as Merlin Olsen and Wilma Rudolph, grateful for the honor and wondering how I could be on the same stage with them. I feel the same way tonight as I look up and down the table. I'm very grateful to you for thinking of me, but am still wondering how I got here. I'm especially glad to be here with so many Tennesseans like Bob, Wyomia and Melvin.

I have found it a good rule of thumb in my public life over the last several years—I hope you will not misunderstand this—to try to avoid being honored ever since I heard the story of how Robert Morris Jr. was honored.

You may have forgotten, but Robert Morris Jr. and his father financed the American Revolution. This was a little before our country was founded. So the citizens of Oxford, Maryland, decided to honor Robert Morris Jr. They picked a very special day and invited everybody in town, sat Mr. Morris up on a stage and gave a 21-gun salute. The stuffings from the cannons came out the back and killed him right on the spot. That was the end of Robert Morris Jr. on the day he was honored. I was thinking about that today. I am sure that nothing like that will happen tonight because I feel very much at home. Where else could a person about to lose his job feel more at home than in a room with 1,500 university presidents, athletics directors and coaches from all over the United States of America? (Laughter)

Our family lived in Australia for a little while. We learned there what the difference is between one of your former award winners (President Bush), the difference between what we are today and what we will be in about a week. In Australia, they say you are a rooster today, a feather duster tomorrow. (Laughter)

I told President Bush just this last week that there was absolutely no reason for all this to have happened; if he had just remembered the principles of the Teddy Award and his own participation in inter-collegiate athletics, which was considerable. Every red-blooded American sports fan knows exactly what to do when you are 23 points behind, time running out and everything is on the line. You call Frank Reich with the Buffalo Bills and he leads an extraordinary comeback.

My fall from grace in about a week is not as hard as it is for a great many people in Washington who are much better known than I am. After we moved to Washington, our children had a little bit of fun with me because they counted up the various cabinet officers and

determined I was 17th in succession if anything should happen to the President. So what that means in practical terms is that between now and next Wednesday at noon, if you turn on your television and see my face on it explaining that everything is all right between the United States and Saddam Hussein, you know we are in very deep trouble because they would have worked through the entire cabinet in order to get to me. (Laughter)

I would like to dedicate this award to Herk Ally. Herk Alley was the Vanderbilt University track coach when I was there in 1960, when as a sophomore I wandered down to the track, which was not much of a track. That is where Herk Ally said: "Hey, Lamar, why don't you go down to the end of the track and run back this way? Let's see how fast you can run."

What I didn't know was that Herk Ally was a coach with no scholarships, a lousy cinder track and very few wins. But he had something he had never had before. He had found three people in the university who could run very fast. He had three legitimate runners and that is not quite enough for a relay team. So I ran from one end to the other. He held a big stopwatch up, looked at it and said "My goodness, less than 10 seconds."

I was startled. I had never been on a track team in my life. I joined that track team. We set a school record. More accurately, the other three did. My goal, my job, my entire position was to get it from the first person to the third person, which I generally did. We had a wonderful time and I learned a lot. I still have some cinders in my left knee to prove it. For a while I thought those two track letters that I earned at Vanderbilt 30 years ago didn't do me much good. I wore my letters on my sweater to the University of Tennessee freshman girl's dorm, and I remember three guys wearing orange threatened to beat me up. One weekend I wore it trying to impress a young lady who was visiting the campus from Ole Miss. She took one look at me and said "How long have you been a cheerleader?" (Laughter)

As the years went on, that competition meant a lot to me. I thought about it when I was at the University of Tennessee working with many of the people who are here tonight and taking pride in seeing a football team move into the top 10, just not in winning, but in the seniors who graduated, of women athletes who almost in every case graduated, students like Melvin who distinguished themselves with the university. I thought about it as I watched my alma mater, Vanderbilt, try to win a very competitive conference and try successfully to maintain high academic standards and build and increase upon a winning tradition. I thought about it when many of us here tonight worked with the Knight Commission and thought through the issues of presidential control, academic integrity and certification—not easy issues.

I thought about Herk Ally and those 30 years ago during the last 18 months when I visited schools in more than 100 places in this big country of ours. Walking into the schools, you get a very accurate thermometer of what the country is like and exactly what it will be like because the children are pretty well informed. Whether in Los Angeles, in the Bronx, in Miami, or in my own hometown of

Maryville, Tennessee, I saw the same thing. America is anxious. Americans feel it is harder to be a teacher, harder to be a parent, harder to be a student. Americans are looking for leadership to help them understand more about what is going on and what we need to know about it. Americans really want a very simple thing—to find ways to get their moorings, get their principles and to understand and remind ourselves of our values and get our feet on the ground.

I remember about how I learned to get my feet on the ground over those years—my parents, my faith, academic inquiry—and then the hard work and sweat and competition that came because of one coach who had no scholarship, a lousy cinder track, not many wins and three members of a relay team, who just happened to see me one day and get out that big old stopwatch, which I will have to assume was defective because I know he would never tell a lie, and said: "Hey, Lamar, why don't you go down to the end of that track and run back to let me see how fast you can run?"

I am grateful to Herk Ally, to Vanderbilt University and to the NCAA. Thank you very much. (Applause)

President Sweet: Mr. Secretary, in recognition of your superb undergraduate career as a student and an athlete, and your continuing commitment to the highest personal standards, this award is presented to you for exemplifying the finest tradition of public service by your tireless efforts to combat illiteracy as United States Secretary of Education, and your distinguished leadership and service to your state as its governor and as the president of the University of Tennessee. Congratulations. (Applause)

I now am pleased to present to Joe B. Wyatt, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, a plaque commemorating this honor to one of its most outstanding alumni.

Joe B. Wyatt (Vanderbilt University): Thank you very much, Judy.

Leroy Walker (United States Olympic Committee): Judy, I know this is not on the program. I take the president's prerogative to do this. As president of the Olympic Committee and for the Olympians who are here tonight and the other thousands who have contributed so much to the welfare of the United States Olympic programs by their participation in Pan American and other games, on behalf of the entire Olympic family, for your great leadership and for all the good things that have happened to us because of the NCAA, may I present this small token of appreciation to you for all the leadership you have given us. (Applause)

President Sweet: Thank you.

Mr. Davis: Thank you, Dr. Walker. Well, this has been an enjoyable evening for all of us. On behalf of the NCAA and all of its members, I congratulate each of our honorees. I also salute you, the members of this Association, for continuing the fine tradition of thoughtfully recognizing these individuals who truly epitomize the values of intercollegiate athletics.

Lastly and personally, I wish to thank Dick Schultz and his staff for inviting me to be your master of ceremonies this evening. I also wish to thank President Bush, Prime Minister Majors and the presi-

dent of Iraq for making it possible. (Laughter)

President Sweet: We are sorry about the circumstances, but you were a terrific master of ceremonies, Jack. (Applause)

Thank you for the outstanding job that you did in paying tribute to these outstanding individuals. We appreciate you sharing your time with us on such short notice. As a token of our appreciation for your serving so ably as the master of ceremonies, and to remind you of the admiration and respect our Association holds for you, I am pleased to present to you a token of our appreciation for your good work tonight and your many; many contributions to the NCAA. Thank you. (Applause)

Now, if you will please rise, we will be dismissed after President Scanlan presents the benediction.

Brother Thomas Scanlan (Manhattan College): Let us again recall that now as always we are in the holy presence of God.

God, as we have been inspired by the extraordinary example of our outstanding student-athletes, the Silver Anniversary, Olympic and Teddy Award honorees, so deep in our commitment to the work of education and the full human development of the student-athletes entrusted to our individual and collective care, may these wonderful young women and men learn through all of us in the NCAA the values of discipline, teamwork, sportsmanship, integrity and equity as well as the real joy and satisfaction in serving others.

Bless each of us gathered here with your continued love and support and bring peace to our world. Amen.

General Business Session

Thursday Afternoon, January 14, 1993

The general business session was called to order at 2:35 p.m., with President Judith M. Sweet presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

President Sweet: I would like to call to order the general session of the Presidential Agenda Day.

I am now opening the "window of reconsideration" for any action taken in the division sessions today. Are there any such motions?

RECONSIDERATION OF DIVISION VOTING ACTION

Reconsideration of Maximum Awards—Division I Men's Basketball

Bob Goin (Florida State University): I move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 30.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal asks for a longer period of transition. It doesn't ask to rescind the number of scholarships, but it does ask for a time frame that they can make their adjustments. I encourage our Convention to acknowledge and recognize that as we vote to reconsider and pass.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): I would urge that we not reconsider Proposal No. 30.

It is a proposal that wouldn't maintain or increase costs but would change the program of cost-containment that we did several years ago. We have a new committee that is going to deal with the issue of cost for intercollegiate athletics. That new committee may bring forward a very dramatically different proposal. However, it is important that as 42 states have reductions in their appropriations to their universities, and 70 percent of Division I schools have had deficits, it is important that we not maintain high cost activities, that we not increase our cost and we stay with the cost reduction that this Convention entered into several years go.

I don't think we should reconsider Proposal No. 30.

Bernadette V. McGlade (Georgia Institute of Technology): I am basically speaking in support of the reconsideration for several reasons.

To tie this proposal in in any way with the efforts of gender equity is not appropriate, because they are not significantly related. The request simply to delay reductions for men's basketball scholarships for one year is necessary due to the difference in absorbing reductions for head-count sports. To legislate two head-count reductions in two consecutive years for a sport that carries a relatively small number of participants is placing a tremendous hardship on the student-athletes as well as the program itself.

I urge the vote for reconsideration.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 30 (Page A-45) was defeated by Division I, 152-169, five abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Reconsideration of Distribution of Graduation-Rate Report

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): I move to reconsider Proposal No. 18. I voted on the prevailing side.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to require the NCAA rather than member institutions to provide information for the graduation rate of the disclosure report to the prospect's evaluation office and high school and two-year college coaches in Division II.

It is our view that since Division I passed Proposal No. 18, that Division II would prefer to do it as well. We think that it is better for the Association to have a consistent policy over a highly independent division. We would rather go along with Association policy.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 18 (Page A-33) was approved, 154-50, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

Mr. Lubbers: I move in Division II the adoption of Proposal No. 18.

[Proposal No. 18 (Page A-33) was approved by Division II, 169-39, two abstentions, roll-call vote.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

NCAA Athletics Certification Program

President Sweet: We are ready to take action on the proposals identified by the Presidents Commission for this general session. We are now on Parts I and J of Proposal No. 15.

Joseph N. Crowley (University of Nevada, Reno): I will point out that the Division I business session this morning passed the bulk of Proposal No. 15. The two parts of that proposal that are before the delegates at this session—I and J, found on Page 29 of the Official Notice—will allow the certification program to be implemented.

Part I would establish the standing Committee on Athletics Certification, an action that requires a common vote from all three divisions of the Association. This portion of the proposal carries an immediate effective date and allows the committee to begin work right away and put this program in place over the course of the next year.

Part J of Proposal No. 15 gives the opportunity to transfer without being subject to the one-year residence requirement in the event that the student's original institution is placed by the Committee on Athletics Certification in a membership category that would preclude the institution's team in that student-athlete's sport from taking part in the postseason competition during the remainder of the student-athlete's eligibility. It was the certification committee's thought that the great majority of the institutions will be certified. But in that rare circumstance that an institution could not demonstrate substantial conformity to the program's operating principles, the committee wanted to ensure that the championship opportunities would not unfairly affect the student-athletes.

On behalf of the Council, as well as the Presidents Commission, I would urge the support of the delegates for Parts I and J in Proposal No. 15.

[Part I of Proposal No. 15 (Page A-13) was approved by Division

I, 311-10, two abstentions, Division II, 186-7, four abstentions, and Division III, 212-6, 20 abstentions. Part J was approved by Division I, 310-11, one abstention, Division II, 192-7, two abstentions, and Division III, 239-2, 17 abstentions. Roll-call votes.]

Joint Policy Board

President Sweet: We will now take Proposals 50 through 59. When we complete those actions, we will use any time remaining to open the floor for questions and comments regarding the work of the Gender-Equity Task Force.

Joseph N. Crowley (University of Nevada, Reno): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I would like to move Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal reflects the growing cooperative relationship between the Presidents Commission and the Council. It was proposed jointly by the Council's Special Committee to Review NCAA Legislative Procedures, which I had the privilege to chair, and the Presidents Commission's Subcommittee on the Role and Structure of the Commission, which was chaired by Eamon Kelly of Tulane. They created the concept of the Joint Policy Board. This Board would include the elected NCAA officers, the executive director of the Association and the officers of the Presidents Commission. It would have the authority to review and to concur in the areas that are listed in the proposal. It would do so without making any significant change in the existing rules of the Council, the Commission and the Executive Committee.

This assures involvement of chief executive officers in all of the significant policy areas of the Association in a reasonable and constructive way, and in partnership. I urge the approval by the delegates.

[Proposal No. 50 (Page A-68) was approved 767-15, four abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Proposed Legislation—Committee Review and Amendment Limitation

Eamon M. Kelly (Tulane University): On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

For years, one of the major complaints that the presidents and chancellors have had about being active in the NCAA concerns the legislative process. This year, the Presidents Commission, working in concert with Joe Crowley and the Special Committee to Review NCAA Legislative Procedures, has taken major steps to try to address these complaints. I want to emphasize, as President Crowley did on Proposal No. 50, that this is a joint effort of a Council-appointed special committee and a Presidents Commission's subcommittee that I chair. One thing that we did was to implement the Presidential Agenda Day at the Convention. This means presidents can be present on major policy issues without having to sit through the legislation dealing with the more detailed day-to-day concerns that can be best acted upon by those on the daily firing line.

Proposal No. 51 takes additional steps. It says that every legislative proposal, regardless of its origin, must be reviewed by an appropriate NCAA committee before it can move forward for action at a Convention. It does not say that the committee has to approve the proposal, just that it must have that review. The committee's reaction—pro, con or neutral—would then be reported with the proposal itself. It might suggest a different approach that could result in better legislation, or at least more acceptable legislation. It might cause the sponsor to withdraw or offer a proposal because of the negative review it receives. It might cause a proposal to wait a year for action, which would not be all bad, or it might give its support to a proposal, thus enhancing its chances of being adopted. The membership would be assured that the Association's expert committee, whatever topic is involved, has discussed the matter carefully before it was presented to the membership.

The other half of the proposal treats another concern not only of presidents but of many other individuals in the membership. We seem to want to change rules every year without ever letting the membership catch up on what is and isn't in effect, or without giving a new piece of legislation a chance to become effective before we change it. This aspect of the legislation would permit the Presidents Commission to designate proposals that would not be subject to amendment for a period of two years after they become effective. There is an escape clause that the Council or the Commission could use in the event of a troubling piece of legislation that needs to be changed. This proposal is designed to stabilize and slow down the legislative process in this Association. It is designed to make proposed legislation more thoughtful and better prepared. It applies to all legislation, including proposals that come from the Council or the Commission.

The Commission and the Council believe this rule will represent a major refinement in the way this organization does its business and will serve to enhance not only the involvement of CEOs in the organization but also the involvement of every member institution. We strongly urge your affirmative vote.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): However well intentioned, Proposal Nos. 51-B, C and D amount to a two-year legislative veto for the Presidents Commission. However, those proposals are fundamentally undemocratic and in my view contrary to the principles of governance of this organization. Their goals can be accomplished by the membership, providing that any considered legislation should be immune from amendment when we pass it. That is a much better and fundamentally sound result.

Therefore, in order to consider separately and to defeat Parts 51-B, C and D, I move those parts be considered separately from Part 51-A.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I rise to speak in opposition to the passage of Proposal 51-A for basically the same reasons as defined by my colleague, Jeff Orleans. Proposal No. 51 mandates that all legislative proposals shall be evaluated by an appropriate NCAA committee before they can be included on the

agenda for an NCAA Convention. This proposal is completely contrary to the spirit of inquiry, which always has been maintained within the organizational governance structures of the NCAA. Chancellors, presidents and CEOs have never been confronted by the constraint of prior review and/or oversight of legislative proposals in advance of discussions on the floor of the annual NCAA Convention.

For example, less than a decade ago, Proposition 48 was institutionalized by the NCAA. Those who initiated this landmark legislation were not constrained in the beginning by the scrutiny of some NCAA oversight committee given the responsibility for examining a proposal. I would have to assume as one of those chancellors who opposed that particular legislation, that if such a constraint had been placed at the feet of those promoting Prop 48, that action immediately would have been questioned by the leadership of that movement because it had the votes.

Therefore, as I see it and taken within the constraints of history, what was good for Prop 48 then must be good for all of us now. We do not support legislation that calls for such scrutiny before it can be presented at the annual NCAA Convention. If we give into this kind of rearranged structure within the operation of the governance structure, then I would suggest that we might very well have signed the death knell to the freedom of inquiry and the spirit of democratization. That has been the mainstay of governance within the NCAA for decades. On that basis, with respect to Proposal No. 51-A, I would urge that you vote no.

Joseph O'Rourke (Wabash College): I oppose this on the grounds that I don't think it is a good parliamentary motion.

This is a group that has been mustered to this Convention and we are trying to mandate the actions for the next Convention. In other words, the dead hand motion. I don't see how this group can do that from one Convention to another Convention. It has never been reconstituted the same way twice.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): I, like Chancellor Fort, am a member of the Presidents Commission. I think that this proposal is really a product of the Commission's growing awareness of the important role it can contribute to the development of legislation.

In its early days, the Commission was perhaps inclined to act upon its own initiative. Subsequently, as you all know, it is giving greater attention to getting input not only from committee, but the various constituencies of the Association. Through the years, I have seen us adopt legislation only to come back at the next session with minor technical amendments that took time and effort that could have been eliminated had the appropriate committee reviewed the process and had an opportunity to suggest changes to the sponsors before that vote was taken. Very often, these are totally positive changes. I don't think that it will stifle any spirit of inquiry because the sponsors of the proposal can go forward whether or not the committee approves it. If it said that the committee had to approve it before it went on the agenda, that would be quite different.

But it does not say that. It simply says the committees will have the opportunity to study it and apply their expertise and advise us of

the impact of the legislation. I would urge the delegates to vote for it. [Part A of Proposal No. 51 (Page A-69) was approved, 536-252, three abstentions.]

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): The Presidents Commission has done quite a few good things in the last several years. I would point out they make no more mistakes than anyone else.

We need to be very careful before installing a two-year period before something can be challenged. I know there is an escape clause, but those things seem to me to be a little bit peculiar. I would point out in the rationale on Page 72, the last sentence says: "It will assure chief executive officers and other institutional representatives that they do not have to return to the Convention each year to defend the legislation they already have sponsored successfully at prior Conventions."

People who are not members of the Presidents Commission have to do precisely that. We are creating an unequal parallel in how people do their business. I am not sure what that last sentence is supposed to contain. If it means they are not supposed to have to defend themselves, then my previous comment applies. If it suggests they should not have to return to the Convention every year, I would simply ask this question: Can these people expect to be effective as part-time participants in the process?

I would urge you not to approve this motion.

William B. DeLauder (Delaware State College): Proposal Nos. 51-B, C and D will have the effect of limiting the ability of the membership to bring certain issues to the floor unless the Council and the Presidents Commission are in support.

This, in my opinion, does not contribute to the democracy within the NCAA. I have no problem with various committees reviewing proposed legislation and advising the membership on the merits of the proposals. This occurs now. I do have a problem with the process in which the will of this body is constrained by smaller, and in some cases, unrepresented bodies.

Proposal No. 51 reduces the democratic process within the NCAA. I therefore urge its defeat.

Mr. Fort: I support the statement made by President DeLauder and by my friend, Jeffrey Orleans, from the Ivy League. There are five bullets: Bullet No. 1, anti-democracy; bullet 2, excessive oversight; bullet 3, antigovernance; bullet 4, denigration of present inquiries; bullet 5, over-regulation.

Vote it down, please.

Olin B. Sansbury Jr. (University of South Carolina, Spartanburg): Parts B, C and D primarily are designed to present some order to what we are trying to accomplish in the legislative process. The Commission would designate these proposals ahead of time and Conventions would have the option of supporting the proposals or not supporting the proposals. I don't see how that qualifies as being undemocratic.

I think it also is an indication that the Commission would be very careful in what proposals it would designate in this manner.

Mr. Orleans: I would simply add to the argument against the proposals. I think it is constraint on the will of this body to be told by the Presidents Commission that we would have to vote against that proposal if we wanted to keep the subject debatable. In the next two Conventions, that is the club that could be held over this membership.

With all due respect to the goodwill, the honor and integrity and the good sense of the Presidents Commission members, I simply believe that the goodwill, the honor and the sense and integrity of the membership at large is what must drive this membership and drive the forum. I propose we defeat Proposals 51-B, C and D.

Mr. O'Brien: Let me opine for a moment on the intent of this legislation and what it actually does say.

It is not the intent of the Presidents Commission to limit consideration at all. It is the intent to say that if a piece of legislation is identified as an important piece of legislation, it should be acted upon and implemented. What we have year after year at this Convention is coming back and reconsidering major legislative items in large numbers from the previous year.

Sixty of the proposals at this Convention were items that had been acted upon overwhelmingly at the last meeting. This would not provide that the Presidents Commission would arbitrarily designate after the fact things that would be stabilized, it would say at the front end this is an important item.

If you vote yes, we should surely do it. If you vote no, we shouldn't do it. It is designed to provide stability to everyone, not just to the presidents, and to not have to take the time of each Convention to reconsider items that were dealt with at the previous Convention. It does provide a proper escape clause for the chancellors or the Commission if there is some legislation with unanticipated consequences. It provides the opportunity for the NCAA Convention to take action on a piece of legislation and not have to act on that legislation until it is implemented. That is the purpose. It identifies those things that if you act on them it is to indicate that we do intend to implement that legislation. If we want to make a correction, it provides the opportunity.

It will allow everyone a chance to carefully consider a piece of legislation; then having considered it, act on it knowing that that is the major policy direction.

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): Democracy is not the issue. The issue is how we as a democratic organization are going to order our business to be the most effective kind of deliberative body.

It seems to me that the most successful democracies have deliberative bodies and a pretty elaborate committee structure. Sometimes that committee structure does block legislation for a while. The committee structure proposed doesn't block anything. It just hopes to give a more reasonable presentation of legislation to the body at large. Democracy has nothing to do with it. I think that Chancellor Fort's five bullets went astray.

Eamon M. Kelly (Tulane University): I want to correct one misimpression that has come from some of the previous speakers that this was solely from the Presidents Commission. I did want you to

recall that this is supported fully by the NCAA Council as well as the Presidents Commission.

[Parts B, C and D of Proposal No. 51 were defeated, 321-463, 12 abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Revised Legislative Calendar

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference and the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am going to make a motion to refer this matter to the Presidents Commission and the Council. I do so after having talked with President O'Brien, the chair of the Presidents Commission, Executive Director Schultz and other leaders of the Association who assure the sponsors that in the coming year they carefully will observe the workings of just-passed Proposal 51 and see how the Proposal 52 concept can be in there.

We particularly are desirous of having two more weeks to obtain the legislative submissions and the signatures required after last year's action. It has caused difficulty because late-summer meetings make it difficult in obtaining properly submitted proposals. I remind delegates that a year ago, 62 percent of the membership favored this proposal. I hope the Council and the Presidents Commission will keep that plus the 106 sponsors from 17 different conferences in all three divisions of the membership in mind.

I therefore move that we refer this matter to the Presidents Commission and the Council with the request that they report back to the 1994 Convention in the hope they can integrate this successfully with Proposal 51.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 52 (Page A-71) to the Council and Presidents Commission was approved, 711-66, 10 abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Administrative Review Panel

David B. Keilitz (Central Michigan University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 53 on behalf of the NCAA Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is the result of the resolution adopted at the 1992 Convention to develop means for providing greater flexibility in the application of NCAA legislation. The Council occasionally has been confronted with situations in which the application of NCAA rules seemed inappropriate and the membership did not provide the latitude to the Council to grant relief.

If this proposal is adopted, the Administrative Review Panel can consider such cases. The panel consists of five members, including a former NCAA president, a former member of the Eligibility Committee, and a former member of the Committee on Infractions. This panel has great experience. The Council has approved guidelines for the panel to begin its work. Appeals require that an institution make requests in writing, signed by the chief executive officer, the faculty athletics representative and the director of athletics. The written request must set forth the reasons the institution believes that relief from the application of the appropriate legislation, interpretations or decisions, are warranted.

In reaching a decision, the panel is to consider the purpose and intent of any and all NCAA-intended legislation, the welfare and involvement of a student-athlete, postcompetitive or recruiting advantages, and other factors it considers relevant. Actions of the panel are final and not subject to appeal to the NCAA Council. It is anticipated that the Administrative Review Panel will develop precedents and additional guidelines once it has handled cases. It will report its decisions regularly to the Council and annually to the membership.

I urge your support of this proposal.

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): Having served two years on the Administrative Committee, I am very familiar with the fact that we have received cases that do not provide for relief under current legislative requirements.

In a number of cases, athletes were not able to seek alternatives. We are convinced this legislation would provide athletes and institutions involved in seeking relief for unusual circumstances that are not dealt with through existing legislation within the constitution a fair appeals process. I urge my Division II colleagues and others at this Convention to support this legislation.

[Part A of Proposal No. 53 (Page A-73) was adopted, 772-16, six abstentions. Part B was adopted by Division I, 316-3, one abstention, Division II, 195-7, one abstention, and Division III, 252-3, eight abstentions. Roll-call votes.]

Committee on Infractions

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): On behalf of the Committee on Infractions, the NCAA Council and the Presidents Commission, I move Proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

For a number of years, particularly over the last three, the Committee on Infractions has begun to realize that its present size of six members is creating a problem. Not a serious problem. It is not that the committee itself as individuals are overworked. But as the number of conferences' memberships are increased and with increasing mobility of members between and amongst academic institutions, the committee has found itself on a number of occasions with four and on an occasion or two with the minimum number of three persons.

We therefore believe that we need to increase to eight the number of members on that committee. At the same time, we are impressed by the fact that in recent years several committees, including the special committee chaired by President Lee of Brigham Young University, and the present Gender-Equity Task Force have brought to bear members outside the Association to participate in the deliberations. We believe that the addition of two members and specifying that two members of the committee should be from the general public and not associated with a present collegiate institution, conference or professional sports organization, would enhance both the deliberative qualities of the committee and also provide for the general public a better understanding of the Committee on Infractions' procedure.

Rex E. Lee (Brigham Young University): On behalf of the Special Committee to Review the NCAA Enforcement and Infractions Process, I would like to support both Proposals 54 and 55. I would

like to state why we support both of those provisions as a committee.

About two years ago, Executive Director Dick Schultz appointed a special committee to study recommendations concerning the enforcement of infractions procedures. It was sometimes referred to as the "Due Process Committee." Our assignment was to come forward with recommendations that would make our procedures more fair and effective. After a period of about six months in which we held hearings, discussions, interviews and deliberations, we made 11 proposals. Due to the good work of the Committee on Infractions, plus the adoption of these two proposals today, all but two of those recommendations will become law.

That is one of the reasons that we move the adoption of those. The other two will come before this group for a vote a year from now. We hope that in the meantime, all of the disagreements concerning those two—open hearings and hearing officers—will be resolved by the special committee.

We support Proposal Nos. 54 and 55.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): Is there a procedure in place on how those individuals will be appointed to that committee?

Mr. Williams: It is my understanding that they will be appointed in the same way that any other member of the Committee on Infractions or any other Council-appointed committee is appointed. Member institutions or anyone may recommend to the Council a person with a statement of qualifications. The Council will draw for that membership from that pool.

Arnold R. Henderson (Virginia State University): In cooperation with my colleague from the University of Virginia, I would like to indicate that we are in support of this item for two major reasons.

Number one, we are indicating to the world that we are in the process of participation by the public. Number two, we are continuing the Jeffersonian democracy process, so we are supporting this and urge you to vote yes.

[Proposal No. 54 (Page A-74) was approved by Division I, 304-17, two abstentions, Division II, 187-12, two abstentions, and Division III, 231-20, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

Infractions Appeals Committee

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): On behalf of the Committee on Infractions, the Council and the Presidents Commission, I move Proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal comes to you with the enthusiastic support of all constituent elements. At present, appeals from the decisions made by the Committee on Infractions—either by institutions or by affected athletics personnel—go to the steering committee of the division in which the decision has been made. It has been felt for some time by both the members of the steering committee and the Committee on Infractions, as well as a number of appellates, that it leaves inadequate time for the steering committee in its busy agendas to give proper consideration.

In addition, there is a concern that because the number of appeals

in any given year are limited, you don't have a panel of experienced persons. It therefore is based upon experience of the Council and Eligibility Committee that we would create a separate Infractions Appeals Committee composed of five members, including one member from the general public, which would act as an appeals committee. It would provide for more timely appeals, provide for greater time for the committee to consider the appeals, and give to the appellates a sense of greater fairness in the appeals procedure. I therefore ask that you support this on behalf of the constituent elements applying for this motion.

[Parts A, D and E of Proposal No. 55 (Page A-75) were approved 781-6, one abstention. Parts B, C and F were adopted by Division I, 316-3, Division II, 197-5 and Division III, 257-1, two abstentions. Part G was approved 774-3, three abstentions. Roll-call vote.]

Resolution: Disclosure of Graduation Rates

Sara N. McNabb (Indiana University, Bloomington): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the 1990 Convention, the NCAA adopted legislation that mandated the collection and publication of graduation-rates data by Divisions I and II. The legislation now applies to all three membership divisions. In November 1990, the Federal government adopted similar legislation called the "Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act." Effective July 1, 1993, Federal legislation requires institutions to report graduation-rates data to the Department of Education for student-athletes receiving athletics aid and to publish this data.

Since its inception, the Special Advisory Committee to Review Implementation of 1990 Convention Proposal No. 24 and the Council repeatedly tried to revise the reporting process to keep it in compliance with Federal requirements. This concept for consistency is crucial because Federal legislation permits the Secretary of Education to waive the Federal reporting requirement if the secretary concludes that the NCAA reporting requirements are substantially comparable to the reporting requirements in the act.

It is not clear when the department will issue the final regulations to implement the act. Once the regulations are issued, it will be appropriate for the Association to forward to the secretary the "substantial comparability" waiver request on behalf of member institutions. This resolution reaffirms the commitment of the membership for the collection and publication of graduation-rates data by the NCAA. It also reconfirms the membership's support for the substantial and ongoing efforts regarding this matter, including the submission of the "substantial comparability" waiver to the secretary.

I urge you to vote in favor of this proposal.

R. Elaine Dreidame (University of Dayton): As a member of the special advisory committee, I also would like to urge the adoption of this resolution

The Association has invested a great deal of resources during the last three years in the development of this reporting requirement re-

lating to graduation rates in a manner that is consistent with the Federal government's requirements. These resources include not only meeting printing and mailing costs, but also the time spent on each campus to become familiar and comply with these new requirements. These efforts resulted in overwhelmingly favorable publicity from the first Division I graduation-rate report that was released last July.

To vote against the resolution would ignore the significant accomplishments that the Association has made related to the disclosure of graduation rates and would send the wrong message to our friends, especially those in Washington, D.C. We urge your support.

[Resolution No. 56 (Page A-79) was approved, 768-8, three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Resolution: Financial Issues

Oscar C. Page (Austin Peay State University): I move approval of Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal Nos. 57 and 58 are the next step in implementing the work of the Presidents Commission Subcommittee on Strategic Planning. This committee is chaired by President Tom Hearn of Wake Forest University.

Last year, this Convention adopted a resolution calling for the study of the financial issues in college athletics. That became the second topic in the Commission's initial three-year plan. The next step is to direct the Commission and the Council to submit appropriate legislation for action at next year's Convention that is based on consideration of the recommendations of a special committee working in this area. That committee is chaired by Jim Delany of the Big Ten Conference. It will submit its major recommendations at the Commission's and Council's summer meetings.

Because of the complexity of the financial issues, some of the recommendations may extend to future Conventions, but primary proposals will be submitted next January. I urge your approval of this resolution.

Joseph C. Lang (Georgetown University): Just one clarification. Is Resolution 57 necessary since the Presidents Commission and the Council already have the power to review committee recommendations and to submit legislation?

Mr. Page: The resolution reaffirms the commitment that we have to proposing legislation for action by the Convention.

[Proposal No. 57 (Page A-80) was approved, 771-6, four abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Resolution: The Student-Athlete:

Welfare, Access and Equity

Mr. Page: I move Proposal No. 58.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is the next step in the strategic plan of the Presidents Commission. This resolution calls for the study of issues of welfare, access and equities as they affect student-athletes. This is intended to prepare legislation for the 1995 Convention. This resolution directs that the topics be studied. A committee chaired by President James McComas of Virginia Polytechnic Institute is in place to do that. The

committee includes athletics administrators, faculty representatives and presidents.

The committee already is soliciting advice from other NCAA committees and will study a wide range of issues. The resolution specifies that the committee's work is to be completed by mid-1994 in order for legislation to be sponsored at the 1995 Convention. We would appreciate a strong expression of support for this study.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I rise to support the previous speaker and offer support of Resolution No. 58. The resolution calls for the Council and other constituencies to conduct a study on the welfare of student-athletes, including a review of the effects of earlier legislation and have recommendations no later than June 1994.

I am convinced that matters relating to the welfare of student-athletes continue to draw national concern. There unfortunately are still too many athletes—a large number of whom are colored, who are female—who have been systematically relegated because of insensitivity, inexcusable ignorance, ethnic or sexual bias, and/or the promulgation that things are not really that bad, just blown out of proportion by the media. There are a lot of reasons why students don't graduate on time.

But the fact of the matter is that many of them do graduate more often than not on time than do their nonathletics counterparts. But in the final analysis, that reality is contrary. There still are a disproportionately large number of student-athletes, who after six, seven or eight years have not graduated. There are reasons for this reality, but I believe one reason for not graduating on time is linked to the fact that there are a number of student-athletes who leave before graduation to place themselves in the pools of professional football, baseball or basketball drafts. Many of them claim hardship, but a strange part of this is that there are newspaper articles about coaches who actually encourage these kids to seize the moment and take advantage of the narrow window of opportunity they have and go pro now. The theory is that if they opt to go pro now rather than wait for graduation, they will avoid all of the uncertainties associated with injury and a decline in market value or the continued ability to maintain academic eligibility. None of the aforementioned can be justified because they basically represent actions displayed by someone who has deluded himself into thinking that this advice is good for these athletes. Nothing could be further from the truth. We saw our kids' ability and led them to believe it is more important to take advantage of marketplace provisions than to wait a year or two and get a degree. Our response is that we have got to get on with the issue of making certain that our Council launches research concerning student welfare, equity and access.

I urge your support of Resolution No. 58.

[Resolution No. 58 (Page A-81) was approved, 774-4, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

DISCUSSION

Gender-Equity Task Force

President Sweet: At this time I would like President Jim

Whalen, cochair of the Gender-Equity Task Force, to come forward along with the subcommittee cochair, Carla Hay, Marquette University, and Charlotte West of Southern Illinois University. As we prepare for the discussion on the report of the Gender-Equity Task Force, I would like to make a couple of comments.

As President Whalen mentioned yesterday, there are no decisions that have been made at this point by the task force. It is extremely important that all sides of the issue be heard and considered and that all options are explored. Most importantly, is the full participation of the membership to assist the task force in reaching the best possible decisions.

James J. Whalen (Ithaca College): This afternoon we are going to invite commentary on what was said yesterday or entertain questions you might have.

Somebody asked me the other day how I got involved with this task force. I thought I should find out, so I asked Ted Tow the other evening. I said: "Ted, I would like to know how I was appointed." He said: "Jim, we wanted to have the very best possible person we could find to work with Phyllis Howlett. He turned us down and you got appointed." (Laughter)

Having said that, I would like to open the floor for questions and comments. I am sure that Carla and Charlotte will give me a hand.

Robert J. Frank (Oregon State University): I have a question regarding the relationship between Resolutions 57 and 58, particularly with regards to the dates. No. 57, which deals with financial issues, calls for appropriate legislation for action at the 1994 Convention and No. 58 calls for appropriate legislation at the 1995 Convention.

Should there not be some consistency in the dates between Resolutions 57 and 58?

President Sweet: The dates have been determined by the Presidents Commission in conjunction with their strategic plan.

Mr. Frank: Should they be reconsidered? You could be making recommendations on financial issues and then have to address later additional issues that might grow out of No. 58.

President Sweet: There is an attempt to coordinate the work of the various committees that are in place right now. We appreciate your suggestion. We will try to ensure that that is carried out.

Mr. Whalen: We have tried to stay in touch with the different committees. I will support what Judy said. We are staying very closely in touch with the various financial committees so that we do coordinate our programs.

Carla H. Hay (Marquette University): I am going to take this opportunity to appeal to the faculty athletics representatives in this body. Other than my work with the task force, I have dealt with gender equity in another area of our university. We can be of great service on our campuses if we try to grapple with this issue and to diffuse some of the contention that understandably it generates and assist the members of our athletics departments as they try to work their way through this issue and come up with equitable and realistic responses to it.

So keep that in mind, faculty reps, when you go back to your campuses. Don't just wait for what comes out of the task force and what comes out of the NCAA. Seize the moment and take the initiative on this on your campus.

Barbara Church (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): Regarding the participation ratio, is the committee talking about ratios that refer to the student-body ratios?

Mr. Whalen: The committee has not settled on any percentages or ratios. There has been discussion of some of the percentages and ratios that have been suggested by some conferences and institutions, but we have not done any more than just discuss those. So there isn't any definitive answer to the ratio question.

Ms. Hay: The institutional standards cause a wide-ranging debate. This issue has come up, but we certainly are not at the point where we are prepared to make any kind of definitive statement on it.

Greg Sankey (Southland Conference): Yesterday in your presentation, you mentioned football is a key consideration in discussion. Could we have a little elaboration on what is being involved in the discussion related to football under gender equity?

Mr. Whalen: I don't know that I used the term "key consideration." I think I said it was a very important issue. There are some very strong points of view on both sides of the football issue. It has been discussed, but not in great detail. We are trying not to let football stand in the way of addressing a number of other issues. It is terribly important to understand that when we get a diverse group of people with different points of view. It takes some time to get to know the point of view that people have and to begin to work more comfortably on some of the very important issues.

Football certainly is important and not easily resolved. Will we address that? We certainly will. That is part and parcel of the whole thing. It will be discussed by the entire committee.

Martha O. Chiscon (Purdue University): In order for the gender-equity issue to move forward in a positive way, it is very important that all members of teams at every level—from the student-athletes through the administration, through our conferences and up to the NCAA—act with sensitivity on a variety of issues.

There was a piece of legislation today that did not pass that I want to comment on. It may have a negative impact upon this level of cooperation that we need in men and women in athletics. That piece of legislation refused to allow men's basketball scholarships to remain at 14. There probably will be a lot of concern and maybe even some animosities on a variety of campuses when one looks at the fact that women are allowed 15 and men will now have to reduce to 13. I think that not allowing the extension of time to see what would happen and to remove that extra scholarship this quickly may cause friction between factions at various levels, which need not have occurred.

The funds that are saved by that one scholarship probably are not worth some of the concern that it is going to cause and some of the backsliding for gender equity that may ultimately result. I am sorry that we did not take that into account earlier.

Mr. Whalen: I cannot speak to that particular issue. It was the will of those who voted. So I can't speak to that specifically.

Let me just say that I do appreciate the fact that three of the proposals that were supported by the committee—11, 27 and 28—were adopted; not because the Gender-Equity Task Force wanted it that way, but because of the will of the group. There may be some animosity about certain inequities. We will have to listen to those kinds of comments, along with all members of the Association. Remember what I said yesterday? We are going to have to have a very thorough review of any of the recommendations. It will take time. We will need institutional commitment. If I understand what you are saying, I don't believe the committee is going to interfere in the voting of the group.

Ms. Hay: If we look at this issue as a participation opportunity, we may have to approach it from a slightly different vantage point. I come from a background where there has been a tendency in women's study programs that you want it to be 50-50—50 for men and 50 for women. I think that approach has dominated something like scholarships in basketball. The same number for women's as the men's is another goal. As you look at this larger picture in terms of allocation and resources, you may have to take some more creative and innovative approaches to participation opportunity that may lead us to certain sports. We will have the authority of more scholarships in order to counterbalance the fact that in other sports—football clearly is one—that we are talking about large numbers of participants.

It is important to think through this discussion, that we try to be as open-minded and flexible as possible, and at least consider the option of taking a different approach to some of these questions. In the initial stages of discussion, we may not be where we end up.

Marcia L. Sanesholtz (Washington State University): I would reiterate what was just said. I think that the principle of gender equity is for each institution to determine what resources it can afford to allocate to intercollegiate athletics and then make sure that those resources are allocated and ensuring equity to their genders. There is not a gender for each sport. So when you are looking at your programs—take the entire program that you offer for your male student-athletes and the entire program that you offer for your female student-athletes—provide equity on both sides. That does not necessarily mean that women's soccer will be the same as men's soccer. It gives an institution the opportunity to choose its priorities and they may differ sport by sport. But your entire programs should provide equitable opportunities for men and women.

David B. Wagner (Georgia Southern University): I have three concerns. I am sure the committee has thought of these. But let me relieve my anxiety by asking them.

First, the basic assumptions with gender equity are that interest is the same between men and women for participation in intercollegiate athletics. I certainly hope that the committee will come up with some sense of that assumption.

Secondly, I would like for the committee to understand about the differences on campuses. It would be difficult if you have a campus of 6,500 students to think that you would have interest in a particular sport. On a campus with 20 sports and 6,000 students, you would have one sport for every 3,000 students. When you get down to the smaller institutions and the limits that we must meet to be in Division I, a campus of 7,000 students with 14 sports, has a sport for every 3,500 students.

We realize that the minimums that are established to be in Division I in the men's program are contrary to the number of sports and the number of grants-in-aid that we have. In order for us to adjust to the women's programs, it is possible to reduce the support for men's programs and stay in Division I.

So, it is additional expenses on the women's side. I hope that they will understand that concept and take that into consideration.

Mr. Whalen: I can assure you that the three items that you brought up already have been discussed at some length. One of the things that we understand very well is that when you have more than 1,000 colleges, universities and associations, there isn't any one single piece of legislation that is going to cover all of them. So we have to look at the total difference. That is very much in the minds of the members of the committee. The issues you raised are important and certainly have been considered by what I consider to be an able, intelligent, educated and experienced group of people on that committee.

Daniel P. Starr (Canisius College): The previous speaker has noted that some of the men's basketball coaches perhaps would take offense because one of the proposals did not pass.

I don't think that was so much the issue. Most of the coaches that I have talked to feel that 13 is very adequate. The problem for some might be why the Convention raised the number of women's grants when this body in the last couple of years has done some commendable work in terms of cost cutting? In this particular case, this seems to be rather superfluous. It almost is a waste from one point of view to have two additional full grants that may amount to between \$10,000 to \$20,000 at some institutions, to be more or less water down the drain where that same amount of money could be spent for women in other ways.

President Whalen mentioned yesterday that we should do our homework before we rush into some of these issues. I think in this case adequate homework has not been done. This money could have been spent much more efficiently on sports foundations for women or other more general types of programs for women rather than basketball scholarships.

Mr. Whalen: What has been done has been done. We change things every year. In the course of events in the next two years, it may seem appropriate to reorganize men's sports as well.

The Gender-Equity Task Force was formed this past year. We have not taken any position on lots of legislation. By this time next year we might. Perhaps the women will see in those individual pro-

grams that it will be better to have those funds directed towards other women's sports. I don't know that that can be accomplished.

President Sweet: I may be able to help with your question. The response to both is that the Council and Presidents Commission support those two legislative items that you referenced with the understanding that there was interest in allowing the Gender-Equity Task Force to complete its work rather than taking action that would impact the grants-in-aid with the possibility that then they may be increased after they decrease. It seemed to make more sense to both of those groups that the task force be allowed to complete its work. Since the proposals would have gone into effect before the task force completed its work, it was necessary to support these proposals.

Douglas B. Fullerton (Montana State University): I listened to my friend from Georgia Southern discuss the problems we have with minimum sports sponsorship on the men's side and we are hearing how that balloons the opportunity issue on the women's side when we try to balance it.

That is a problem, but that also may suggest a solution. For years we have defined broad-based criteria as gender specific. We have said they must have so many men's sports and so many women's sports. I hope that the committee takes a look at maybe redefining what broad-based program is in a total number of sports. Proposal No. 68 is leading in that direction. If Division I had a total of 14 sports, then let the institutions decide whether they want to factor in football. We also may do the same thing by defining broad-based criteria as a minimum number of grants-in-aid and let the institutions decide whether to factor in football.

Mr. Whalen: As I said yesterday, all comments and ideas are appreciated.

Ms. Hay: Those are exactly the kind of creative approaches that we are discussing. Whether we will ultimately recommend them does not preclude somebody else from doing so. We are thinking in those kinds of flexible terms. We do want redefinition of what constitutes a broad-based program rather than the traditional approach that we take. That might be one creative solution to that type of program.

Mark H. Murphy (Colgate University): Colgate University has a real interest in Title IX issues. I would like to focus on what you see as the end results of the committee's discussions and specifically if you have discussed the possibility of introducing Federal legislation to clarify the standards that we are to hold to on Title IX?

Mr. Whalen: We are charged to develop a gender-equity principle. We then were asked to make recommendations and devise principles. I believe that there is some agreement on the task force that we would be coming forward with recommendations and principles to be discussed by the Council and by the Association. It would then be up to the Association to decide whether that is moved into legislation.

I can't speak for the committee, but I don't think that we are going to recommend any Federal legislation. We are talking to your constituents in the NCAA. We will be recommending certain kinds of principles that we think might help us establish a principle of equity and fairness in a global perception. We are so used to legislation in

this organization, so used to having everything reduced to two points or 10 positions I think that in this equity we may have to change a little bit. We may have to look at it a little bit differently. That is something that will take a little bit of time. We are reporting back to you, not to the Federal government.

Karol A. Kahrs (University of Illinois, Champaign): Recognizing the past efforts with respect to cost containment and also recognizing there is a fair amount of conflict in achieving cost containment and gender equity at the same time. I would like to know what constraints have been placed on the Gender-Equity Task Force in not increasing costs to maintain reform that already has occurred in the area of cost containment?

Mr. Whalen: There have been no restraints placed on the committee. We have been asked to review what presently is happening and to make recommendations. We are under no constraints whatsoever. We have been charged to do certain things. They have not told us that we cannot look at anything. We will look at every possibility.

Ms. Kahrs: Is it accurate to assume if one is innovative and creative, that we might take a different direction than a traditional direction? If it does appear that it costs extra dollars to arrive at the ultimate goal of gender equity, will you be able to present the Presidents Commission and/or this body alternatives?

Mr. Whalen: It would be up to the committee in its deliberations at the end to make these recommendations. I have no idea what they will recommend. I don't think that they would force anyone to increase the funds. The task force certainly can recommend funding possibilities and creative ways to find more money to make it more equitable. It is impossible to foretell the outcome of what we will come up with other than we will live up to our commitment to come up with recommendations and principles.

Thank you very much for your tolerance. I look forward to being back next year with Phyllis Howlett. (Applause)

[The Presidential Agenda Day of the general business session was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.]

Saturday Morning, January 16, 1993

The general business session was called to order at 8:05 a.m. with President Sweet presiding.

[Note: Motions were made, seconded and approved to accept the reports of the sports and standing committees, treasurer, Council and Executive Committee.]

SUPPLEMENT TO MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Catherine C. Haker (College of St. Rose): In addition to those individuals recognized on Wednesday, please add the following:

Wilson Bell, Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Iris Brown, Norfolk State University
Irvin Christenson, Concordia College, Moorhead
Jacobi Christianson, Concordia College, Moorhead
Edward A. Coray, Wheaton College (Illinois)
Frank Griffin, Western Kentucky University

Henry Hawkins, Texas Southern University
Henry P. Iba, Oklahoma State University
Arthur Lawrence, Union College (New York)
Karl J. Lawrence, Colgate University
Bill Nicholas, Tournament of Roses
Frank Patrick, Pennsylvania State University
James V. Sabatelle, Pennsylvania State University
Moses Sharpe, Johnson C. Smith University
George Sherman, Wayne State University (Michigan)
Fred Vescolani, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
John Winnie, University of Iowa

Please stand and observe a moment of silence for those who have gone before us. Thank you.

OPENING REMARKS

President Sweet: As we begin voting on the remaining legislation before this Convention, let me report to you again that all of the actions taken during the business sessions will appear in next week's issue of The NCAA News dated January 20. In that issue you will have the record of all the votes taken at this Convention. We have distributed a listing of all voting actions taken up to this point, including those taken yesterday by the respective divisions and subdivisions.

Those actions stand unless they are reconsidered or rescinded in this session. If you intend to reconsider such an action, that can only occur in the "window of reconsideration" that will be announced immediately after action on the consent package. As for attempts by the Convention to rescind a division action taken yesterday, I will call your attention to the division's vote. If anyone intends to rescind any such action, that is the time to rise and do so.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Consent Package

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposals 1 through 14, more commonly known as the consent package.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

RECONSIDERATION OF VOTING ACTION

Reconsideration of Golf—College-Am Tournaments

Tom Davis (Sam Houston State University): Having voted on the prevailing side, I move reconsideration of Proposal No. 108-A.

President Sweet: Is your motion for Division I only?

Mr. Davis: Yes.

President Sweet: The motion is for reconsideration by Division I only. The motion to reconsider is debatable.

Dianne Dailey (Wake Forest University): One of the concerns of the schools voting against Proposal No. 108 was the possibility that the length of the golf tournament would be extended beyond three days. This was not the intent of the authors nor the golf coaches. The intent is to play the college-am on the practice-round day, which is the day before the tournament begins. As stated yesterday, the students would not miss any more classes nor receive prior participation.

The purpose of the college-am is to raise money for the school program and to help defray the cost of running a tournament. If this proposal passes on reconsideration, I would like to move that the proposal be referred to the NCAA Council for consideration in issuing an interpretation or modifying an interpretation to conform with the proposal's intent.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 108-A was defeated by Division I.]

Reconsideration of Seasons of Competition— Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier

Jack E. Kvanetz (George Mason University): Having voted on the prevailing side of Proposal No. 70, I move reconsideration in Division I.

[The motion was seconded.]

We heard some very compelling arguments on both sides of Proposal No. 70 in the Division I business session. However, I think that we sit here with our number one interest—the student-athletes at our universities.

Proposal No. 70 will give us an opportunity to serve those student-athletes both academically and athletically in a much fairer and more equitable manner. I encourage the group to vote for reconsideration and pass the proposal.

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): The strongest argument for voting no yesterday may have been that coaches will recruit the partial nonqualifiers at those schools where their programs are receptive to that. The schools that do not recruit partial nonqualifiers do not want that kind of competition. The strongest argument in favor of the motion is that the best interest of the student-athlete is at stake. Although not everyone wants to take them, these young people are qualified for participation if they meet the qualifications after they get to the university.

The best way to see that we do the right thing for them to graduate is to motivate them the best we can. Passing this motion would help. I urge your reconsideration.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I am speaking in favor of reconsideration so that we have an opportunity to allow everyone to vote his or her conscience in reference to this particular issue rather than their basketball record.

It is easier in this country for a convicted murderer or a perpetrator of an S&L crisis to get paroled than it is for a Prop 48 to regain one year of eligibility to play basketball. There are mixed messages that are being sent. But the message that I would like to send to those individuals who are social economically deprived is that there is a chance. If you do your work, if you succeed, you do have an opportunity. Let's give them a chance. Let's keep hope provided to them.

Katherine R. Lammon (St. Francis College (Pennsylvania)): I heard yesterday from the opponents of this proposal that students might end up taking an unplanned conglomeration of course work after finishing their degree program.

If we trust and believe in our academic counselors, there is no rea-

son that these students cannot be enhancing their education by either taking a second degree program, a minor that will enhance the degree that they have already completed or going ahead and pursuing graduate education.

There absolutely is no reason in the world why this proposal has to hurt a student's education. It can certainly enhance it in any of those three manners.

Jason C. Wilkie (Central Michigan University/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): Some opponents to this proposal say that it will reduce the penalty for not meeting the eligibility index.

As a student-athlete, I don't feel that is true. Being labeled a Prop 48 athlete is probably penalty enough. It is labeling an athlete as stupid. I am guilty of that stereotype. I knew a Prop 48 athlete last year. I didn't say anything but later learned that he got a 3.100 GPA that semester. I don't look at him as a Prop 48 athlete any more. As a student-athlete, I feel that discrimination. You can only imagine the magnitude and prevalence of this with the media, coaches and faculty and administration. Being labeled a Proposition 48 athlete is penalty enough. The student-athletes must overcome a stigma attached to being a Prop 48. This proposal gives student-athletes a way of redeeming themselves.

On behalf of the student-athletes, I urge you to reconsider this proposal and encourage your vote in favor of this.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 70 (Page A-89) was defeated by Division I, 137-148, one abstention, roll-call vote.]

President Sweet: Are there any other items to be reconsidered at this time? Seeing no one at the microphones, the "window of reconsideration" is now closed. We will proceed with the remaining legislation.

[Note: The results of votes taken in the division business sessions were reported as the proposals appeared in the Convention Program and are not reprinted here unless additional action was taken. The results also appear in the proceedings of each business session and in Appendix A.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Individual Eligibility—Drug Testing

Robert M. Sweazy (Texas Tech University): On behalf of the Eligibility Committee and the Council, I move Proposal No. 74.

[The motion was seconded.]

Charles Cavagnaro (Memphis State University): The intent for the legislation on Proposal No. 74 was passed at the 1990 Convention.

A student-athlete ruled ineligible for a minimum of one year as a result of a positive drug test also would be charged with the loss of one season of competition. The legislation did not anticipate all circumstances. For example, a redshirt potentially could avoid any penalty. The Eligibility Committee has required the conditions for restoration of eligibility in such cases to ensure equitable results for drug-testing violations.

It is desirable that the wording of applicable bylaws make clear that any student-athlete who violates the banned-drug legislation

will not be restored to eligibility until he or she sits out at least one calendar year and experiences the loss or equivalence of a full season of competition. It is worth noting that this proposal does not change the intended minimum sanctions for an NCAA positive drug test. It merely clarifies the legislation and confirms legislatively what the Eligibility Committee has been doing administratively since 1990.

The proposal also is endorsed by the Executive Committee. I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 74.

Gerald M. Lage (Oklahoma State University): It always is very difficult to talk about legislation that has a minimal consequence on the vast majority and yet can be so devastating to a few.

To my knowledge, there are three football student-athletes, perhaps more, who have lost a season of competition without ever playing a single down because of the interpretation based on a proposal that was withdrawn and never voted on. I have no problem with the interpretation made by this committee in terms of equity among student-athletes from this point forward. But to go back and penalize three individuals, based upon a rule that was not in the Manual, that was based upon a vote that was never taken and based upon debate that never took place, seems in this case to be a little unfair.

My question is if the vote is in on this legislation, the intent of this Convention would have been clear, that we have not had the debate on whether this proposal is meant to be competitive or if it is meant to be punitive, and if punitive, what is the proper degree?

If we adopt this, would these three student-athletes have that year reinstated if the vote is no?

President Sweet: It would not have an effect on those students.

Mr. Lage: Thank you.

Matthew Leighninger (Haverford College/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): Our committee voted to support the proposal since it is a measure that would standardize a positive drug test. I competed in track and field—a sport in which representation at some levels offers competitive balance and has suffered greatly from the use of performance-enhancing drugs.

We think that penalizing students equally for a positive drug test is the best way of ensuring the perception and reality of fairness in NCAA competitions.

[Proposal No. 74 (Page A-92) was approved.]

Eligibility—Season-of-Competition Waiver

Robert M. Sweazy (Texas Tech University): On behalf of the Eligibility Committee and the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 75.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Eligibility Committee has reviewed a number of cases in which student-athletes have used a season of competition as a result of a certification error by an institution. The Eligibility Committee and the Council believe it is both appropriate and fair for the student-athlete to regain a year of eligibility under these circumstances.

The proposal is limited in scope and would not apply to eligible student-athletes who simply participate in a limited number of contests nor would it provide relief for mistakes made by a member of the institution's coaching staff. It is directed to give relief in those

few instances in which student-athletes, through no fault of their own, rely on the institution's formal declaration of eligibility and use a season of competition through very limited participation.

I urge your adoption of Proposal No. 75.

Richard Kacmarynski [Central College (Iowa)/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee]: I would like to add our support to this proposal.

We feel that a student-athlete should not be unfairly punished and this provides a mechanism for a student-athlete to regain a year of eligibility when he was inappropriately certified.

[Proposal No. 75 (Page A-94) was approved by Division I.]

One-Time Transfer Exception—Division I-AA

Dave Hart Jr. (East Carolina University): Under Bylaw 5.3.11.1.2 provisions, I move to rescind the action taken by Division I-A yesterday relating to Proposal No. 78, which is the one-time transfer exception.

The main concerns among Division I is one of a procedural concern and that Division I-A at no time had an opportunity to take an actual vote. This obviously impacts upon Division I-A and sets what I think is a dangerous precedent with the ability of the young person to transfer with no penalty. I move that this be rescinded.

President Sweet: Is your motion for Divisions I-A and I-AA only to consider this?

Mr. Hart: No, the motion would be for the entire Convention.

Willard S. Belknap (Southland Conference): We are the sponsoring conference of this legislation. I would ask the body to vote against rescission. Although we are the sponsoring conference, this really was generated from the Division I-AA meeting last spring. Almost all of the 115 representatives of various institutions favored this proposition. In our business session, only four votes were opposed to it. This is not intended nor do we believe it will result in campus raids or wholesale transfer of student-athletes from Division I-A to I-AA. It simply extends the current one-time transfer exemption to those students from Division I-A down to I-AA football. It will affect a limited number of student-athletes and a limited number of institutions.

We believe that there are adequate safeguards in the legislation. Permission is required by the institution from which they are transferring. Don't forget there are letters-of-intent limitations that the student-athletes will have. It is sort of a no harm, no foul type of rule that would involve few students. It is a students-right issue in our mind. We urge the body to vote against the motion.

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): Let me just add to what Commissioner Belknap said.

There are two issues that the membership needs to be aware of. The first issue is that the one-time transfer exception, which we currently have in sports other than football, basketball and ice hockey, is being extended to Division I-AA football. We also would like to caution the membership that this requires a series of permissions. The National Letter of Intent still is in effect. In fact, even the prominence of Division I-A institutions is a factor in that. This is the

same rule that we already have for transferring from Division I that Divisions II and III have enjoyed for some time.

The logic of allowing Division I student-athletes to transfer to Divisions II and III certainly holds in this case also. There also is a bigger procedural issue that we have got to address. We don't need to have a situation where one division or even one classification is imposing itself on another.

In our Division I-AA business session, we felt that we had to delay action on Proposals 117, 118 and 120 until we heard the results from Division I-A. In fact, Proposal No. 121 was not even available to Division I-AA for a vote. The peaceful resolution of this is that the Divisions I-A and I-AA leadership resolve it. They will spend the next year working to overcome this procedural problem and bring to next year's Convention the ability for Divisions I-A and I-AA to address football issues in a common forum.

We urge the membership not to allow rescission.

Charles M. Neinas (College Football Association): I concur with Wright Waters.

We have a procedural problem that we are somewhat hesitant to bring a rescission that deals with Divisions I-A and I-AA football before the entire Convention. We feel that this is a very dangerous precedent whereby one division is establishing the transfer rules that really impact on another division. The safeguards that are mentioned are fallacious. If I am a football player at an institution and request a release and do not receive it, for all intents and purposes, the coach has probably lost me anyway.

We also are trying to maintain a solid retention rate to help individuals graduate. We could see pitfalls whereby a coach who is running into the upper limit, may desire to develop some type of a farm system and send his mistakes to a Division I-AA institution. There are too many problems associated with this particular rule. It should not be enacted at this time. I agree we need to have a better cooperative effort. On behalf of the College Football Association, we will pledge that effort to work with Division I-AA.

In the interest of maintaining a reasonable and sane transfer rule, we would like to request that the membership favor and rescind Proposal No. 78.

Bradford W. Hovious (University of Texas at El Paso): I also favor rescission of this particular rule.

If this rule is meant for students, then we need to do it for all students. We need to be able to give Division I-AA athletes the right to go up to Division I-A or go down to Division II. We need to look at this in terms of the whole membership, not just a particular sport and a particular division. I therefore would hope that we rescind this rule.

Pauline N. Saternow (Youngstown State University): We originally were opposed to this legislation. After attending the American Football Coaches Association Convention, our coaches believed that Division I-A did not oppose. So we voted in favor.

Now, hearing the arguments of Division I-A, I would encourage my colleagues in Division I-AA to vote to rescind the motion.

(The motion to rescind Proposal No. 78 (Page A-97) was defeated

(two-thirds vote of entire membership required), 368-242, 21 abstentions, roll-call vote.)

On-Campus Employment

R. Elaine Dreidame (University of Dayton): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 82.

(The motion was seconded.)

During the past year, the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism has discussed the inequities associated with counting only the employment earnings of student-athletes who work on campus and not the earnings of student-athletes who work off campus in the team-equivalency calculations.

The committee formulated Proposal No. 82 to address its concern by requiring institutions to count on-campus earnings during the academic year toward the maximum institutional financial aid limitations in the same manner that we treat off-campus earnings. Employment earnings, be they from on- or off-campus employment, only would count toward the maximum if athletics interests are involved in arranging the employment for the student-athlete. This would put on-campus earnings on the same footing as off-campus employment earnings, which is justified in the opinion of the committee because both are self-help assistance and they are not nonrepayable grant funds.

On behalf of the financial aid committee and the Council, I urge your support for Proposal No. 82.

Judith A. Davidson (Central Connecticut State University): I must voice opposition to Proposal No. 82.

Proposal No. 82 is representative of that kind of well-intentioned financial aid legislation often considered and adopted by the Association without clear understanding of its implications. I hope to provide clarification of some issues in what appears to be rather straightforward beneficial legislation. The proposal must be read very carefully to clearly understand its intent. Current legislation provides that all on-campus student employment—work study and otherwise—is countable aid. This amendment proposes to count only employment in the athletics department or employment outside the department for which the athletics interests of the institutions can receive. Official Interpretation No. 7 specifies that work study is included in this definition of employment.

The intent is to permit student-athletes to work on campus and earn noncountable money, which is an apparent benefit to the needier students who are limited in awards by other financial aid rules. But it is precisely this point that creates the dilemma with this legislation. This is similar to the controversial 1992 Proposal No. 72, which was defeated. Passage of this legislation also will eliminate the counting of some financial aid for purposes of Division I institutions to meet the minimum financial aid requirements for divisional membership.

From moderate budget programs, the question is simple. How many institutional dollars or how many scholarship equivalencies toward the minimum will be lost by not counting these resources and what impact will that have on these programs? While the spirit of

the legislation is good, this proposal should be given a second thought. Consider more broadly what passage of this legislation does to the financial aid rules. Most student employment will become non-countable. We already don't count loans and honorary scholarships. We no longer count the Pell Grant. What will remain? We have the 23-page chapter and a separate financial aid manual dedicated to the concern and issue of countable aid, but almost no aid left to count. Let us wait for a review and analysis of the financial aid models coming from the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics. Let us not tinker with the financial aid rules here.

I urge your opposition to Proposal No. 82.

[Proposal No. 82 (Page A-100) was defeated (two-thirds vote of entire membership required), 368-242, 21 abstentions.]

Financial Aid—Gradation or Cancellation

John E. Wagnon (University of Central Oklahoma): On behalf of all eight members of the Lone Star Conference, I move Proposal No. 86.

[The motion was seconded.]

The passage of Proposal No. 86 will allow member institutions to graduate or cancel the student-athlete's financial aid effective on the date the student-athlete voluntarily quits participation in varsity athletics.

At the present time, the bylaw mandates that the aid will be continued until the end of the semester or quarter. Last spring, there were five separate instances in our conference where student-athletes abused this provision. In all five cases, the student-athlete started the semester and in a matter of just a few days came to their coach and told the coach that they were quitting the team. As the coach discussed the situation with the student-athletes, in every case they admitted that they had plans to quit the team before the start of the semester but purposely waited until after the semester had started so they could continue to receive their financial aid for the rest of that semester.

Our conference members think that some student-athletes feel they have discovered a loophole in our Association bylaws that allows them to quit their athletics team and still receive the same financial benefits as those students who continue to participate. This does not seem fair to our member institutions or to the other student-athletes who continue to participate.

We urge approval of Proposal No. 86.

Matthew Leighninger (Haverford College/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): Our committee opposes this proposal more than perhaps any other piece of legislation under consideration at this Convention.

We do realize that the NCAA regulations on termination of scholarships are vulnerable to abuse by both coaches and student-athletes. This will probably always be the case. Proposal No. 86 concerns us because it increases the likelihood of abuse by coaches and in our estimation that type of abuse is more harmful to student-athletes than to the NCAA as a whole. Voluntary withdrawal can be dif-

ficult to define. The circumstances surrounding a departure of an athlete from a program is complex. The scholarship will be graduated or canceled if the student withdraws before the first contest date. After the first contest date, the institution can only wait until the end of the semester to take action on the scholarship of a student who has withdrawn from a program.

We believe this current set-up is beneficial because it allows the student-athletes to arrange other means of financial support for their education and to consider all options. There is no legislative solution that would eliminate the possibility of abuse on this problem by coaches or student-athletes. The consequences of student-athlete abuse are not as severe as the consequences of abuse by coaches. An institution will survive the expenditure of a scholarship for one semester. The opportunity for a student with a scholarship that has been canceled may not survive.

Thomas E. Spicer (Fort Hays State University): I agree with both speakers. I would like to interject this one opinion. Student-athletes who take advantage of this situation are no different than the coaches who take advantage of the student-athletes.

Student-athletes who choose to quit the program on their own volition should have their scholarships graduated. For coaches who choose to dismiss kids for whatever reason, the institution should stand behind that scholarship. There is a definite message to be sent here. Students need to understand that they need to be held accountable also. We should pass this legislation.

[Proposal No. 86 (Page A-103) was defeated.]

Unclassified Football—Division I

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I move Proposal No. 131.

[The motion was seconded.]

Before I speak to this proposal, I need a point of clarification that this legislation only would be necessary in football. There are members of the Convention who have indicated to me that I have the authority to do what this proposal states now in the sport of football and that this legislation is unnecessary. If that is true, I would gladly withdraw it. I have received indication that it is necessary and I want to get a clarification before I proceed or withdraw it.

President Sweet: If you want to have a varsity football program in Division I, it has to be classified I-A or I-AA.

Mr. Rienzo: If I wanted to have a sport in any other program, it would not have to be so classified, if I was not using it for the sports criteria?

President Sweet: Are you referring to that sport being football?

Mr. Rienzo: No, I am referring to every other sport.

President Sweet: There are not separate divisions in any other sport.

Mr. Rienzo: I could have this kind of proposal or program in any other sport in Division I, but I may not have that in Division I?

President Sweet: If you want to have a varsity football program in Division I, it would be necessary to have this legislation.

Mr. Rienzo: I want to apologize to the Convention for taking the time to address the problem that only may be unique to Georgetown

University. Believe it or not, in my lifetime Georgetown University played football in the Orange Bowl on New Year's Day.

But because of a previous financial crisis in athletics, it was forced to drop football. However, it returned to Georgetown University in the late 1960s. In 1973, the creation of Divisions I-A and I-AA football allowed the grandfathering of 27 programs to continue to play in Division III football. Georgetown University has 24 intercollegiate programs and more than 600 student-athletes. We are not looking for a loophole in order to keep our basketball program in Division I, because we can be in Division I without football. However, we have a problem in football because for 15 years we have been playing against Division III opponents. However, at the 1991 Convention, the Council, the Presidents Commission and the membership asked Georgetown University to trust them that they would find a place for us where we could continue to run our football program in a cost-effective way.

This trust was deposited in a proposal that became affectionately known as Division I-AAA football. The good faith placed by us in the I-AAA concept collapsed with the failure of I-AAA football legislation at the 1992 Convention. It may very well prove to be fatal to the football program at Georgetown University. Given this serious economic climate in which intercollegiate athletics is operating, the concerns of gender equity and the urging of the Knight Commission to pare down the athletics budgets, football offered Georgetown students the opportunity to continue to play football without creating enormous financial demands upon Georgetown.

Division I presently accommodates schools that do not conduct football programs. Proposal No. 131 would provide the opportunity for Georgetown to continue cost containment in football. Other proposals for other schools may be satisfactory. There is not a satisfactory resolution for our football program in NCAA legislation. Under No. 131, an institution operating for cost containment in football would be allowed to provide only need-based financial aid to student-athletes.

Without the ability to offer athletics scholarships in football, Georgetown would not be able to compete for recruits with Divisions I-A, I-AA or II institutions.

In summary, Proposal No. 131 allows a member of Division I to play unclassified, cost-containment football without interfering in the operations, voting or participation in championships of Divisions I-A, I-AA, II or III. The passage of No. 131 would enhance the football opportunities available to the students at Georgetown University without a negative impact on any other institutions. I thank you for your support.

R. Daniel Beebe (Ohio Valley Conference): I urge you to vote against Proposal No. 131.

I was a member of the Collegiate Commissioners Association Subcommittee that was assigned the task of advancing legislation that would address the needs and interests of the Division I football-playing schools that were disenfranchised by the elimination of multiple classification for football. This subcommittee was composed of representatives from conferences that played scholarship football and

from conferences that play nonscholarship football. The subcommittee took due care to consider all concerns by institutions from these conferences. As a result, we advanced Proposal Nos. 72 and 133, both of which previously were adopted at this Convention.

We strongly believe that our proposals adequately address all football programs in Division I, whether they are scholarship or non-scholarship. We believe that Proposal No. 131 is unnecessary with the adoption of Proposal No. 72 and Proposal No. 133. With these proposals, a Division I football program can be classified in Division I-AA and be conducted in the fashion outlined in Proposal No. 131 without the additional legislation and possibly confusing classification.

On behalf of the Collegiate Commissioners Association Subcommittee on Football, I request your defeat of No. 131.

Mr. Rienzo: This is the last time. I certainly respect Dan's position on this. However, they did take into account everyone's problems except Georgetown University. I would ask you that this is not a new classification, this is unclassified.

The Division III schools that presently play Georgetown University in football and are on our schedule are more than happy to play us. But they cannot play us if we revert to club football or have to drop football.

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): I rise to remind my colleagues that we were in total support of this concept in the past. I urge them to continue to support this proposal in wholehearted fashion.

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Football Conference): At last year's Convention, several Division I-AA members spoke in opposition to I-AAA football. Unfortunately, this was construed by some to mean that we were opposed to accommodating those football programs that were being displaced by the elimination of multidivision classification.

This was not our intent. Immediately after the failure of the Division I-AAA football legislation, we began working to find an equitable solution to all member institutions impacted by this decision. For those wishing to establish low-cost football as well as the traditional Division I-AA programs, we believe that was accomplished yesterday with passage of Proposals 72, 105 and 133. This set of proposals was developed by the Collegiate Commissioners Association, sponsored by the Council and supported by the Presidents Commission.

Low-cost programs now are viably accommodated in Division I-AA, and No. 131 is not necessary. I would urge defeat of Proposal No. 131.

Leslie J. Poolman (Dickinson College): I urge my Division III counterparts to support this motion.

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: I would like to ask the previous speaker why he urges Division III to support this proposal. It seems like it already has been addressed. There are options that are available. Plus, Resolution No. 151 also is going to address the issue for the future.

Could you comment on it? I urge defeat of the proposal for Division III members.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): Although I can't speak for Les Poolman, we happen to be one of the schools that appears on the Georgetown University schedule. We certainly empathize with the problem it has.

Even though there are members in this assembly that seem to think that the legislation that has been passed takes care of Georgetown's problems, the people most directly affected, Georgetown, seems to think it hasn't. Georgetown has been a very good opponent for five or six schools in our particular geographical area. Its student-athletes are very similar to the student-athletes that we put on the field. The competition has been very good. They don't intend to participate or they don't want to participate in the Division III championship. They can't do that. They just want to keep football alive.

I don't see why the Convention doesn't help them keep football alive at Georgetown University. I urge Division III to support them.

[Parts A and B of Proposal No. 131 (Page A-143) were defeated (common provision requiring majority vote of each division in Divisions I and II; approved in Division III. Parts C through H moot.)]

Membership—Two-Season Requirement

Harold Dorf (Northern Michigan University): On behalf of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 134.

[The motion was seconded.]

May I just provide you with a brief rationale for the intent and the circumstances involving this?

The intent of Proposal No. 134 is to specify that member institutions shall conduct at least one sport for each gender in two out of three sports seasons. It should be noted that the only change to the proposal creates from three- to two-season requirements. The minimum of four varsity sports per gender is not changed. For some institutions and conferences, there is a need to have some latitude to sponsor sports during the season that best fits our weather conditions, geographical location or academic calendar.

Regarding the calendar and geographical area, in some parts of the country—Salt Lake City not excluded—we do get quite a bit of snow. In our conference, there are some member institutions that receive over 200 inches of snow per year. For those who are not mathematicians, that is over 16 feet. It therefore is extremely difficult for us to schedule spring sports. The scheduling is difficult. It sometimes will require us to rent facilities in order to have spring sports. That adds to the cost. We sometimes have to retain student-athletes after the academic year in order to complete the season.

The change is from three to two seasons requirements. This would help relieve the situation. I urge your support of Proposal No. 134.

[Proposal No. 134 (Page A-147) was defeated, 323-249, 27 abstentions.]

Developmental Training Expenses

Mary Ellen Cloninger (Bowling Green State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 139.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the 1991 Convention, the membership established an exception to the Association's amateurism regulations to permit an individual to receive developmental training expenses from the U.S. Olympic Committee or the appropriate national governing body during the summer vacation period even if the training program involved no competition. That legislation was adopted on the premise that for summer training programs, submitting the receipt of expenses without requiring competition would not conflict with an individual's academic pursuits and would encourage the development of athletes at all age levels.

The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believes that such has been the case with the current rule. The committee considered this past year a request from the USOC to liberalize the rule for developmental training programs conducted during the academic year. The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee is of the opinion that Proposal No. 139 can provide opportunities for athletics development during the academic year without compromising the academic interest or conflicting with dates of institutional competition.

On behalf of the Olympic Liaison Committee and the Council, I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 139.

[Proposal No. 139 (Page A-151) was approved.]

Medical Examinations

Ronald J. Maestri (University of New Orleans): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I rise to speak in support of Proposal No. 140.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is designed to benefit the student-athletes by allowing them to be given a medical examination conducted by representatives of professional league scouting bureaus. Current NCAA regulations prohibit professional athletics teams from conducting medical exams during the academic year for student-athletes in any sport. Since this proposal permits a scouting bureau to conduct only one medical examination per student-athlete during the academic year, this should not provide a significant interruption for those student-athletes' academic or athletics activities at the institution.

Additionally, since the exam must take place on the institution's campus, there should not be an opportunity for the student-athlete to jeopardize his amateur status by receiving any form of expenses or benefits from the professional athletics team. Inasmuch as the exam must take place on the institution's campus, this should afford the athletics department an opportunity to be present with the student-athlete to supervise the exam. The adoption of this proposal will not affect student-athletes who wish to play in the NFL since the NFL does not permit its personnel to conduct medical exams on college campuses.

I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 140.

Charles S. Harris (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 140.

The conference applauds the efforts of the Professional Sports Liaison Committee and believes that this proposal does have merit. It does question, however, some flaws that may exist in its construction. It does not provide the kind of protection that necessarily

should be afforded student-athletes. In particular, there are no limitations in time during the course of the year when on-campus physical examinations can be given.

I contrast that to the Pacific-10 Conference, where very specific limitations are placed on even reviewing films by sports enterprises. In passing this legislation as currently written, we will provide more opportunity for access to student-athletes than we do for films.

We believe in the long run legislation like this should be enacted, but this legislation is inappropriate. I urge you to defeat this proposal.

[Proposal No. 140 (Page A-151) was approved.]

Media Guides

J. Douglas Elgin (Missouri Valley Conference): I move adoption of Proposal No. 141.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 141 will permit member institutions and conferences to use noninstitutional outlets for marketing and sale of media guides. Currently, institutions in conferences are permitted to use noninstitutional outlets, such as distribution companies, to sell videotapes.

The Communications Committee feels it is only logical that this privilege be extended to the sale of media guides. Independent publishers currently generate profits for themselves by selling preseason publications that contain names and likenesses of student-athletes. Independent publishers also generate revenue by publishing magazines and newspapers that report solely on an institution's athletics program. These companies do not share any of these revenues with conferences or institutions. The Communications Committee believes that institutions and conferences have the right to sell their media guides in any manner they see fit.

The committee has addressed this issue with the Council and the Council is sponsoring the proposal. I urge your support as well.

[Proposal No. 141 (Page A-152) was approved.]

[Note: The delegates heard the reports of the Men's and Women's Committees on Committees and the Nominating Committee and approved the slate of candidates.]

Travel Expenses—Exception

Keith R. Phillips (Seattle Pacific University): I move Proposal No. 148.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 148 provides for an additional exception in gymnastics for the United States Gymnastics Federation collegiate championships. At the present time, there are some restrictions on travel as it pertains to competition that makes it very difficult for this championship to proceed effectively. This exception is very important in order for that championship to have the same opportunity to provide year-end competition and national championship competition for these athletes.

I urge adoption of No. 148.

[Proposal No. 148 (Page A-158) was approved.]

Principle of Nondiscrimination

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): As chair of the

Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 149.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the membership guidelines there exists no clearly defined statement regarding the Association's position on discrimination. The Council, by agreeing to sponsor such legislation, recognizes that it is important that the Association's principles for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics contain a statement related to nondiscrimination. The Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee, in keeping with its long-range plan that has been adopted by both the Council and the Presidents Commission, established this principle of nondiscrimination in order that the Association may become proactive in this commitment to equal opportunity.

It should be clearly understood that the intent of this legislation is not aimed at governance policies such as how we select what team will play in which championships, but rather the categories of discrimination that have traditionally denied individuals the right to access equal participation and governance. The Council felt that this statement should represent the traditional general discrimination categories, but be general enough as to not exclude any group. Over the course of many research projects, studies and statistical reports, we are aware that severe discrepancies between the minority population as a whole and those invited into the fields of athletics administration, at both the professional and collegiate levels, exist. Given the national concern over this issue and the concern the committee knows that the Association shares, it is our responsibility to address the enhancement of all individuals at all levels of intercollegiate athletics.

Today an opportunity exists for the NCAA to set the national agenda for our institutions to become proactive in the development of all individuals who participate athletically, academically and socially in our society. I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 149.

[Proposal No. 149 (Page A-158) was approved.]

NCAA Staff Interpretations

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): I move adoption of Proposal No. 150 on behalf of the NCAA Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council and steering committee have become aware of a wide diversity of views on this proposal. The Council considered withdrawing the proposal to further review the issues. However, it decided it wanted to hear additional comments concerning institutional positions. Accordingly, the Council has withdrawn its support for this proposal, but has moved to allow an opportunity for a full discussion. As you might detect, that is an unusual position for the Council to take.

This proposal is intended to make interpretations of NCAA legislation provided by the legislative services staff advisory rather than binding. In the 1980s, the Council determined that the staff interpretations should be binding on those institutions that received them. The present constitutional provision became a part of the NCAA Manual in 1989. I am one of those on the Council who believes the

proposed change would be helpful to the membership.

First, in supporting this proposal, we want to state our belief that the quality of the staff interpretations in recent years has been consistently high and thus increasingly useful to the membership. It makes administration of our complicated regulatory system much easier to be able to call and get prompt and reliable answers to our questions.

Second, it is anticipated that if this proposal is adopted, the staff will continue to respond to requests for interpretations from the membership in the same manner it does today. The member institution or conference will have the benefit of the staff expertise in determining how to apply the legislation. If a binding interpretation is necessary, a request to the NCAA Interpretations Committee and to the Council, as provided in the bylaws, can be made. A main reason for the proposed change is that it will encourage institutions and conferences to take greater responsibility for understanding and applying NCAA rules.

The NCAA staff's role can return to one of assisting the membership rather than appearing to tell members what to do in a particular circumstance, which seems inappropriate. This will enhance the relationship between the staff and membership without lessening the understanding of the proper application of NCAA rules or decreased staff services.

Just to reiterate, under the related bylaws, the Interpretations Committee and Council process remains in place. The processing of infractions cases should not be affected by the change.

I urge your support of this proposal.

Timothy W. Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference). I rise in opposition to this proposal.

Under the current scenario, when we get an answer from the NCAA office, whether we like it or not, we know at least that it is safe. If this proposal passes, there can be profound liability. Those of us in Division III do not have compliance officers. Being the commissioner of a Division III conference, I am the compliance officer of 10 institutions. Our liability is multiplied tenfold.

It is not a question of shirking responsibility. It is a question of preserving a mechanism that allows us to travel in safe waters. This legislation appears to have very little to gain and a whole lot to lose. We have enough problems in college athletics. I don't think we need to open the door to create more problems.

Harold J. McGee (Jacksonville State University): From the perspective of those on the Council who did not support the position, it was felt that small schools, small conferences and small associations do not have very formidable compliance procedures and staffing or resources. The NCAA staff has provided excellent interpretations. The binding portion thereof has well served small institutions and small colleges.

We would urge that you not support the proposal.

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I also would urge defeat of Proposal No. 150.

This is a step in the wrong direction. Institutions should be en-

couraged to seek interpretations. This would lead to a movement away from uniform interpretations of legislation. We strongly urge defeat of this proposal.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): Speaking on behalf of the New Jersey Athletic Conference, I urge defeat of this proposal. Interpretations that come from the NCAA staff have been high in quality. To change at this time would give the perception that there are problems with these interpretations. Perceptions being what they are, I think this would give the membership the wrong message.

I therefore urge defeat of this legislation.

Dolores Bogard (State University College at Cortland): In my experience with NCAA interpretations, the staff will give you an interpretation from an official interpretation by your Interpretations Committee. This is not going to change if we change this to a non-binding decision. The staff interpretation still will be representative of the official interpretations from the committee.

Britton Banowsky (Southwest Conference): A lot of time was spent in developing this proposal. The Collegiate Commissioners Association came out in overwhelming support of this proposal. It is a complex issue. It deals with issues of fundamental fairness because of the selectively binding nature of these interpretations.

Earlier today we spoke with David Price, chair of the Legislative Review Committee. We think it is appropriate to have the Legislative Review Committee look at this proposal in more detail. For those reasons, I move we refer it to the Legislative Review Committee for further study in connection with its deregulation work.

[The motion was seconded.]

Constance Hurlbut (Ivy Group): I rise to support referral of this proposal. An enormous amount of time has been put into this. This proposal also would help to encourage deregulation of some areas of legislation that I think most people would support. Also it would encourage conference responsibility. I support referral.

[Proposal No. 150 (Page A-159) was referred to the Legislative Review Committee.]

Resolution: Federation by Sport

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I move Resolution No. 151.

[The motion was seconded.]

We are involved in cost reduction, cost containment, gender equity, inability to fund all of our programs at the same level, a disproportionate growth of cost and paperwork within compliance with the rules and regulations of this Association and dissatisfaction with the levels at which programs are competing.

This resolution is intended to have a committee of the Association look at the concept of federation by sport. Federation by sport would be similar to what the AIAW did a generation ago, similar to the way the Olympics program is conducted in this country and throughout the world and would provide the ability to conduct programs on the national, regional or local level.

Yesterday, in looking at Proposals 57 and 58, it was clear that the Presidents Commission was looking for a directive from this body to

pursue study in a particular direction. It is clear that we are pursuing deregulation. There presently is a committee looking at the concept of federation by sport—the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics. This certainly would be an appropriate place for this resolution to be examined. I therefore request the Convention to support Resolution No. 151 because a no vote would be a signal that we don't want to look in the direction of federation by sport.

A yes vote would mean that we want to examine federation by sport to determine if it is viable.

Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien (University of New Orleans): Speaking as an institution, not on behalf of the Presidents Commission, but as one involved in these questions, I think this is a very sound resolution.

It would be very appropriate for this Convention to approve this resolution to call for this review and also to refer it to Mr. Delany's committee. It is working on this topic. It offers potential for cost containment, deregulation and gender equity. I speak in favor of the resolution.

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): I feel a little uncomfortable after the two distinguished speakers have just spoken in support of this.

However, on behalf of the Council, I rise in opposition to Proposal No. 151. The Council is not opposed to the intent of this resolution. In fact, the Council is in support of a study of federating our rules on a sport-by-sport basis. The Council's concern with this resolution is that there are already several existing NCAA committees, not just one, that are studying the issue of federation.

The Recruiting Committee already is in the process of seeking input from the various coaches associations regarding their interest in federation and the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics also is addressing this topic as part of its charge. The Council opposes this resolution because it does not believe in the spirit of cost containment that a new committee should be appointed to study an issue that already is being considered by other NCAA committees. Therefore, I ask you to join the Council in its opposition to this resolution.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): Yesterday in a question from the floor in reference to different committees having responsibilities in different areas, it was the response of the chair that the committees would work in cooperation in examining this issue in a wide variety of perspectives. That was viewed as valuable. A yes vote reaffirms the intention of this body to examine federation by sport. It does not endorse federation by sport, it merely examines it and studies it. I urge you to vote yes on this resolution.

President Sweet: Frank, may I ask for a clarification? In the resolution, you are asking to appoint a committee. In your comments, you indicated that you felt that it would be appropriate to refer it to the financial consideration committee.

Mr. Rienzo: It could be any committee of the Association that could be appointed to study the resolution about federation by sport.

President Sweet: We are trying to clarify if you are suggesting that it be a new committee or could it be an existing committee?

Mr. Rienzo: I think it should be an existing committee. I recommend that the Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics continues the direction that it is going. I am looking for reaffirmation that this is a good idea we should look at.

President Sweet: That is an important clarification. I believe the previous speaker's comments were based on it being a new committee.

Robert E. Hartwell (Adelphi University): I encourage the Division II membership to support this. This type of investigation will aid us in problems with our championships.

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): Frank is asking to study it. It already is being studied. I see this as an unnecessary resolution.

[Proposal No. 151 (Page A-159) was approved.]

Championship Criteria—Minimum Sponsorship Exception

Eugene F. Corrigan (Atlantic Coast Conference): Before too many people bail out, I would like to take a minute to recognize a special person. I don't think there are many of us who have been in this Association for a long time that thought a Division III athletics director would ever serve as President. Certainly none of us ever thought it would be a woman.

President Sweet: Including me. (Laughter)

Mr. Corrigan: Judith Sweet, you are a very special person. You are quiet, but you have been a leader to this Council by your thorough attention to the details that are necessary to provide guidance to the Executive Committee. You have extraordinary ability to see both sides of an issue and to keep focused on the important issues.

You clearly are the most effective and graceful consensus builder to ever lead this Association. In short, Madam President, you are the best. We appreciate your leadership. (Applause)

President Sweet: Gene, thank you for reading that just the way my mother wrote it. (Laughter)

You are going to make it hard to continue. I hope I don't do anything to blow it from this point forward.

Mr. Corrigan: Having said that, I certainly hope you will all support my move of Proposal No. 152.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Executive Committee, this proposal would ensure that none of the National Collegiate Championships for which all three divisions are eligible would be discontinued before the 1994-95 academic year even if they failed to meet the minimum sponsorship requirements. If this proposal is not adopted, the men's gymnastics and men's water polo championship, and possibly men's and women's fencing and skiing are in jeopardy of being discontinued after the 1993-94 season. The Executive Committee is near the completion of a year-long study of the entire championship programs, including issues relating to the establishment and maintenance of championships.

Specific proposals resulting from our study have been outlined in The NCAA News. One of those would lower the current sponsorship requirements for maintaining a championship. We actively will seek the membership's reaction to this and other proposals shortly after the Convention before we take final action in May. It would be our intent to review your comments and propose specific legislation for the 1994 Convention to treat these issues. In the meantime, we urge you to adopt Proposal No. 152 to continue these National Collegiate Championships through 1994-95 so that the Executive Committee can complete its study and provide the membership an opportunity to address the entire sponsorship issue at the 1994 Convention.

Chris Monasch (Northeast Conference): The Council supports Proposal No. 152 and urges its adoption.

[Proposal No. 152 (Page A-160) was approved.]

Basketball Officiating Committee

John H. Harvey (Carnegie Mellon University): On behalf of the Division II and Division III Steering Committees, and with the support of the Council and the Executive Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 156.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will increase from 12 to 16 the membership of the Basketball Officiating Committee by adding representatives of the Divisions II and III men's and women's basketball interests to the committee.

The Basketball Officiating Committee currently is only made up of representatives of Division I basketball interests. This committee provides some assistance to Divisions II and III officiating programs, but the decision as to what assistance is needed by Divisions II and III are made by a committee composed entirely of Division I members. The Divisions II and III Steering Committees believe that suggestions for improving Divisions II and III officiating programs should come with input from individuals who represent these two divisions and who have a better idea of what is needed in improving the officiating programs in Divisions II and III.

This proposal would add the needed Divisions II and III representatives to the committee. I urge your vote in favor of Proposal No. 156.

[Proposal No. 156 (Page A-163) was approved.]

Special Events Committee

Donnie Duncan (University of Oklahoma): As chair of the Special Events Committee and on behalf of that Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 158.

In recent years, the primary work of the Special Events Committee has been administered by the Postseason Football Subcommittee, which has included 10 individuals who represented Division I-A institutions and conferences.

Only issues that focused on all-star basketball and football games were reviewed by the entire 12-person committee. The two members of the committee who have not represented Division I-A institutions have been women. They, therefore, only attended one short meeting each year that focused on issues that related to all-star games.

Those meetings always were on the morning that followed a longer meeting of the Postseason Football Subcommittee. This arrangement created an awkward environment for both Division I-A and non-Division I-A members of the committee. The Special Events Committee developed this amendment to establish a structure that would include all members in all committee discussion. Since approximately 90 percent of the committee's work focuses on the Division I-A football issues, the Special Events Committee and the NCAA Council believe that the committee should have a federated structure that includes individuals who represent Division I-A institutions and conferences.

The committee recognizes and respects the outstanding resources that are available in other divisions and plans to consult with other individuals to develop information on the issues that do not relate to Division I-A football. We urge your support of this amendment.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors of Proposal No. 158-1, we would like to applaud the Special Events Committee for this legislation. On the basis of their warm assurances as to Division I-AA football representatives' close consultation, we will withdraw No. 158-1 and also note that Nos. 159 and 160, which we cosponsor, also are withdrawn. So we are almost ready to go home.

[Proposal No. 158 (Page A-165) was adopted by all three divisions.]

CLOSING REMARKS

President Sweet: As we near adjournment, I hope that you will allow me a few moments for comments and reflections before I pass the gavel.

This may well be one of the most difficult assignments that I have had in the past couple of years. Two years ago when I received the gavel, I tried to speak to you over the thumping of my heart. Now, I add a lump in my throat. I am not quite sure how this is going to turn out, but I hope that I can adequately express to you what I feel in my heart. I am sincerely grateful for the opportunity to have served as NCAA President and to join you in addressing topics vital to intercollegiate athletics and higher education. I feel fortunate to have worked with so many outstanding professionals, both from NCAA member institutions and from the NCAA staff.

Earlier in this session, you elected the new members of the Council. I feel it is appropriate to pay tribute to those who will be leaving the Council, who I know share some of the same feelings that I am feeling right now.

It is difficult for me to just reflect on the past two years since I have had the good fortune of being a member of the Council for the past 10 years. So my comments really will be directed to observations that I have had for the past 10 years.

Beginning in 1981, with the initiation of women's championships in the NCAA; the restructuring of the NCAA Council in 1983 from a 22-person body to a 44-person group; in 1983, the adoption of more stringent freshman and continuing-eligibility standards. In 1984, the establishment of the Presidents Commission. In 1985, changes in legislation to give the chief executive officers greater control of insti-

tutional athletics programs and to impose more severe penalties for major violations. In 1987-88, the national study of intercollegiate athletics conducted for the Presidents Commission to assess the effects of participation in intercollegiate athletics on student-athletes. In 1989, we had the adoption of the revised NCAA Manual. In 1990, the initiation of the reform movement, cost reduction and membership structure as well as time demands on student-athletes leading to legislative changes in 1991. In 1990, the initiation of the new revenue-distribution plan. In 1991, much to all of our delight, we gave birth to electronic voting. In 1992, we embraced strengthening of academic standards. In 1993, we have taken another significant step in reform with the approval of certification.

During this time period, we have created three standing committees of significant importance: the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee, the Committee on Women's Athletics and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. We have been more responsible in recognizing the rich diversity of member institutions and individuals and the needs and interests of both. What has transpired is due to the efforts of many, many people. While it is true that the lead sled dog may be the only one with the decent view, the sled doesn't move unless there is a whole team pulling.

There is more work to be done. The Presidents Commission's strategic plan calls for the following Convention Agendas: in 1994, Financial Conditions and Gender Equity. In 1995, Student-Athlete Welfare, Access and Equity. In 1996, Integrity, Ethics and Sportsmanship.

We must continue to work to enhance communication. We must listen to each other. We must continue to be willing to evaluate what we are doing and make changes where necessary. As John F. Kennedy once said: "There are risks and costs to a program of action, but they are far less than the long-range risks and costs of comfortable inaction."

I am sincerely grateful for the cooperation and support I have received from the membership, the officers, the Council, the Executive Committee, the entire NCAA staff and Alan Chapman. I also would like to express appreciation to the University of California, San Diego, and especially my staff for their support. I have benefitted personally and professionally in so many ways. I hope that I have been able to give back at least a fraction of what I have gained. I hope that I will have the opportunity to contribute more in the future. These 10 years, and especially the last two, have been wonderful for me. I will never forget them and I thank you for the opportunity that you have provided me.

It is fitting with the increased involvement of chief executive officers that our new president is a president and former member of the Council and Presidents Commission. At this time, I would like to call on President Crowley to come forward and receive the gavel and adjourn the meeting.

Joe has done so much for the NCAA already, and he has been well conditioned for the next two years, having attended more than 20 meetings in conjunction with his responsibilities as chair of the certi-

fication committee. I look forward to his continued leadership. I know that we will all benefit.

President Crowley, I hope that you enjoy your tenure as president of the NCAA as much as I have enjoyed mine. Congratulations and best wishes. (Applause)

President-Elect Joseph N. Crowley: Ladies and gentlemen, we face a difficult choice at this time between a two-hour inaugural address and a motion to adjourn. Do I hear a motion to adjourn?

[The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 a.m.]

Appendix A

87th Annual Convention

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposed amendments shall be effective as indicated; the term "Immediately" means that the legislation, if adopted, becomes effective upon adjournment of the Convention. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1992-93 NCAA Manual. All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 87th annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments-to-amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.*]

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 87th ANNUAL CONVENTION

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1 through 14	Consent Package
15 through 59	Presidents Commission Grouping
60 through 68	Personnel
69 through 81	Eligibility
82 through 93	Financial Aid
94 through 114	Playing and Practice Seasons
115 through 130	Recruiting
131 through 138	Membership
139 through 148	Awards/Expenses/Amateurism
149 through 151	Governance
152 through 155	Championships
156 through 160	Committees

Consent Package

Proposals 1 through 14 are offered as a "consent package" of amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon with a single vote, requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption inasmuch as the package contains certain dominant provisions.

NO. 1 DRUG-TESTING CONSENT FORM

Intent: To apply the legislation related to the administration of the drug-testing consent form on a federated basis, and to specify

Legislative Proposals _____ A-1

that the administration of the form to Division III student-athletes shall occur prior to competition, as opposed to practice.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.2.4.6.1, page 10, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"3.2.4.6.1 Administrative Requirements The consent form shall be administered individually to student-athletes each academic year at the time the intercollegiate squad first reports for practice or prior to the Monday of the institution's fourth week of classes, whichever date occurs first. The consent form shall be kept on file in the office of the director of athletics, and such file shall be available for examination upon request by an authorized representative of the NCAA. Failure to complete and sign the consent form shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation (i.e., practice and competition) in all intercollegiate athletics."

B. Constitution: Amend 3.2.4.6 by adding new 3.2.4.6.1, page 10, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"3.2.4.6.1 Administrative Requirements — Divisions I and II. In Divisions I and II, the consent form shall be administered individually to student-athletes each academic year at the time the intercollegiate squad first reports for practice or prior to the Monday of the institution's fourth week of classes, whichever date occurs first. The consent form shall be kept on file in the office of the director of athletics, and such file shall be available for examination upon request by an authorized representative of the NCAA. Failure to complete and sign the consent form shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation (i.e., practice and competition) in all intercollegiate athletics."

C. Constitution: Amend 3.2.4.6 by adding new 3.2.4.6.1, page 10, as follows:

[Division III only]

"3.2.4.6.1 Administrative Requirements — Division III. In Division III, the consent form shall be administered individually to each student-athlete prior to the student's participation in intercollegiate competition each academic year. The consent form shall be kept on file in the office of the director of athletics, and such file shall be available for examination upon request by an authorized representative of the NCAA. Failure to complete and sign the consent form shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation (i.e., practice and competition) in all intercollegiate athletics."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee) and all members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal specifies that the administration of the drug-testing consent form in Division III shall occur prior to competition, as opposed to practice, which was the rule prior to the 1992 Convention. The former administrative framework pro-

vided more flexibility for Division III member institutions, especially in those sports in which the playing segment does not begin prior to the early part of the academic year. This proposal will not change the legislation or interpretations applicable to the administration of the consent form in Divisions I and II.

Action: Nos. 1 through 14 were adopted as a consent package.

NO. 2 COMPOSITION OF COUNCIL AND PRESIDENTS COMMISSION

Intent: To eliminate one independent Division I-A position on the Council and the Presidents Commission.

A. Constitution: Amend 4.1.1.1, pages 17-19, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"4.1.1.1 Division I Representatives. The 22 Division I representatives shall include at least four individuals from each of the Division I representation regions (as set forth in 4.7.2.1) and also shall include:

[4.1.1.1-(a) and 4.1.1.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Two One representatives of Division I-A institutions that do not belong to a football-playing conference;"

[Remainder of 4.1.1.1 unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend 4.5.1.1, page 23, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"4.5.1.1 Division I Representatives. The 22 Division I representatives shall include at least four from each of the four Division I representation regions (as set forth in 4.7.2.1) and also shall include:

[4.5.1.1-(a) and 4.5.1.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Two One representatives of Division I-A institutions that do not belong to a football-playing conference;"

[Remainder of 4.5.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: Immediately; representation criteria to be met by attrition.

Rationale: This proposal will permit the current composition of the Council and the Commission to reflect the recent change in status of the Big East Conference to a Division I-A football-playing conference.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 3 COUNCIL, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND PRESIDENTS COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP — ALTERED STATUS

Intent: To permit a member of the Council, Executive Committee or Presidents Commission to complete his or her term of office when legislative action alters the membership status of the individual's institution.

A. Constitution: Amend 4.1.2.1 by adding new 4.1.2.1.1, page 19, as follows:

Legislative Proposals _____ A-3

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

4.1.2.1.1 Exception — Legislative Action. When legislative action by the NCAA membership alters a Council member's status to the extent that the individual no longer meets these requirements, the individual shall be permitted to complete his or her term of office on the Council."

- B. Constitution:** Amend 4.2.2.1 by adding new 4.2.2.1.1, page 20, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

4.2.2.1.1 Exception — Legislative Action. When legislative action by the NCAA membership alters an Executive Committee member's status to the extent that the individual no longer meets these requirements, the individual shall be permitted to complete his or her term of office on the Executive Committee."

- C. Constitution:** Amend 4.5.2.1 by adding new 4.5.2.1.1, page 23, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

4.5.2.1.1 Exception — Legislative Action. When legislative action by the NCAA membership alters a Presidents Commission member's status to the extent that the individual no longer meets these requirements, the individual shall be permitted to complete his or her term of office on the Presidents Commission."

Source: NCAA Council.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will permit the Council, Executive Committee and Presidents Commission to retain continuity and expertise when the membership's legislative actions alter the membership status of individual members of those groups.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 4 AMENDMENTS — PRIMARY CONTACT PERSON

Intent. To eliminate the requirement that the primary contact person for amendments and amendments-to-amendments must be from among the proposal's sponsors.

- A. Constitution:** Amend 5.3.2.1.2, page 33, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

5.3.2.1.2 Primary Contact Person. All amendments to the constitution and bylaws proposed by member institutions shall designate a primary contact person *from among the proposal's sponsors.*"

- B. Constitution:** Amend 5.3.2.2.1, page 33, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

5.3.2.2.1 Primary Contact Person. All amendments-to-amendments to the constitution and bylaws proposed by member institutions shall designate a primary contact person *from among the amendments-to-amendments' sponsors.*"

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Council recognizes that there are legitimate reasons for identifying a primary contact person who is not from among the proposal's sponsors. For example, affiliated members (e.g., American Volleyball Coaches Association, College Football Association) are not permitted to sponsor legislation but often serve as the coordinating body for proposals. It appears proper that an officer of the affiliated member could serve as the proposal's primary contact person.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 5 RECRUITING CONTACTS — WRITTEN PERMISSION

Intent: To permit the director of athletics at the certifying institution to delegate to another athletics administrator the authority to provide a written release to another member institution that is seeking permission to discuss transfer possibilities with a student-athlete from the certifying institution.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.1.3, page 84, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

13.1.1.3 Four-Year College Prospects. An athletics staff member or other representative of the institution's athletics interests shall not make contact with the student-athlete of another four-year collegiate institution, directly or indirectly, without first obtaining the written permission of the first institution's athletics director **(or an athletics administrator designated by the athletics director)** to do so, regardless of who makes the initial contact. If permission is not granted, the second institution shall not encourage the transfer and shall not provide financial assistance to the student-athlete until the student-athlete has attended the second institution for one academic year. If permission is granted to contact the student-athlete, all applicable NCAA recruiting rules apply."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal is intended to provide a more practical and flexible approach when it is necessary for a second institution to receive written permission to discuss the possibility of a transfer with a student-athlete from the certifying institution.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 6 OFFICIAL VISIT — STUDENT HOST

Intent: To permit the \$20 daily entertainment allowance during an official visit to be utilized to cover the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the prospect and all student hosts.

Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.5.1, page 106, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

13.7.5.5.1 Multiple Hosts. If several students host a prospect,

the institution may provide only one student host \$20 per day entertainment money may be utilized to cover the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the prospect and the all hosts. The other students shall pay for their own entertainment. Only one student host per prospect may be provided a free meal if restaurant facilities are utilized."

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Under current legislation, if several students host a prospect, the institution may provide only one student host with entertainment money to cover the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the prospect and one student host. The other student hosts must pay for their own entertainment. The Interpretations Committee and the Council recommend that the \$20 per day entertainment allowance be utilized to cover the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the prospect and all hosts. This legislation does not result in any increase in total entertainment money and allows an institution more flexibility in determining how to spend the money. The restriction that permits only one student host to receive a free meal if restaurant facilities are utilized would remain in effect.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 7 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY — INTERCOLLEGIATE COMPETITION

Intent: To permit student-athletes to utilize institutional equipment during the academic year without utilizing a season of competition (or a contest/date of competition), provided the equipment does not include any institutional identification, and to clarify that a student-athlete who competes during the academic year in the uniform of the institution or wears apparel that includes institutional identification would utilize a season of competition (as well as a contest/date of competition).

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.02.6, page 121, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.02.6 Intercollegiate Competition. Intercollegiate competition occurs when a student-athlete in either a two-year or a four-year collegiate institution:

[14.02.6-(a) and 14.02.6-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Competes in the uniform of the institution, **or utilizes any apparel or equipment received from the institution that includes institutional identification;**

[14.02.6-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Competes and receives from the institution any type of equipment or clothing for the competition."

[Remainder of 14.02.6 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.8, pages 205-206, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"17.02.8 Intercollegiate Competition. Intercollegiate competition is considered to have occurred when a student-athlete in either a

two-year or a four-year collegiate institution does any of the following:

[17.02.8-(a) and 17.02.8-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Competes in the uniform of the institution, **or utilizes any apparel or equipment received from the institution that includes institutional identification;**

[17.02.8-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Competes and receives any type of equipment or clothing from the institution for the competition."

[Remainder of 17.02.8 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee)

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: A student-athlete should be permitted to utilize institutional equipment (e.g., golf clubs, tennis rackets) when participating in noncollegiate competition while not representing the student-athlete's institution without utilizing a season of competition (or a contest/date of competition), provided the equipment does not include any institutional identification.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 8 DEGREE STATUS — FOREIGN STUDENT- ATHLETES

Intent: To specify that a foreign student-athlete who achieves a foreign postsecondary degree that is identified as a "baccalaureate" but is not equivalent to a United States baccalaureate degree and who is entering an undergraduate program of studies may be eligible to compete at an NCAA institution as a transfer student, subject to review on a case-by-case basis by the Association's Academic Requirements Committee and its Foreign Student Records Consultants.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.8.2, page 125, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"14.1.8.2 Postbaccalaureate. A student-athlete who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school of the institution he or she previously attended as an undergraduate (regardless of whether the individual has received a **United States** baccalaureate degree **or its equivalent**), or a student-athlete who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, may participate in intercollegiate athletics, provided the student has eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within the applicable five-year or 10-semester period set forth in 14.2.

"14.1.8.2.1 Foreign Student Exception. The remaining eligibility of a student who has received a foreign postsecondary degree that is identified as a 'baccalaureate' but is not equivalent to a United States baccalaureate and who is entering an undergraduate program must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the Association's Academic Requirements Committee and its Foreign Student Records Consultants."

[14.1.8.2.1, renumbered as 14.1.8.2.2, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will confirm that the eligibility of a foreign student who has obtained a "baccalaureate" that is not equivalent to a U.S. baccalaureate, shall be determined by the Academic Requirements Committee and the Foreign Student Records Consultants.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 9 TEST-SCORE TIME LIMITATION

Intent: To confirm that a foreign prospective student-athlete enrolled in the second phase of a two-tiered secondary diploma system may be considered to be in the final term of secondary education for the purpose of fulfilling the test-score component of the Association's initial eligibility requirements.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.3.1, page 134, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.3.1.3.1 Test-Score Time Limitation

"(a) Division I: At Division I institutions, the minimum required SAT or ACT score shall be achieved no later than July 1 immediately preceding the individual's first full-time enrollment in a collegiate institution or the end of the term in which the individual completed the requirements for high-school graduation (including, for a foreign student-athlete who is completing secondary education in a foreign country, the term in which the individual completed the requirements necessary to enroll in a collegiate institution in that country)."

[Remainder of 14.3.1.3.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Prospective student-athletes in many foreign countries are enrolled in two-tiered secondary diploma systems. In Ontario, for example, a prospective student-athlete may receive a secondary diploma for grades 1-12 and receive a postsecondary diploma for grade 13. Either diploma, or both combined, may be used to fulfill the requirements for high-school graduation; however, the postsecondary diploma for grade 13 is required for university entrance in Canada. This proposal will confirm that a student enrolled in grade 13 may fulfill the test-score requirements for initial eligibility during that year.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 10 ALL-STAR GAME AWARDS

Intent: To apply bowl-game awards limitations to all-star games.

Bylaws: Amend 16.1.4.2, page 188, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.1.4.2 Special Events and Bowls. Awards for participation in special events (such as postseason football games, NCAA championships and other established meets and tournaments, all-star games, featured individual competition) and established regional or national recognition awards (e.g., Wade Trophy, Heisman Trophy) may be presented only by the management of such an event or awards program or by an institution that has had or will have a team or individual participate in that event.

"16.1.4.2.1 Number and Value of Awards. The total value of any single award to any one student-athlete for a special event may not exceed \$300, except awards presented by the Association to student-athletes for participation in NCAA championship events per 16.1.4.2.2 and for most-valuable-player awards per 16.1.4.2.3. Multiple awards may be presented only by the institution and the management of the event if the total value of all awards presented for participation in the meet (e.g., a multievent winner in a gymnastics or track and field meet) or in honor of the student-athlete's achievement does not exceed \$300, except for bowl-game and all-star game awards per 16.1.4.2.4.

[16.1.4.2.2 and 16.1.4.2.3 unchanged.]

"16.1.4.2.4 Bowl-Game or All-Star Game Awards. Awards presented to student-athletes from the sponsoring agency of a certified postseason bowl or all-star game shall not exceed \$300 in value. The value of additional awards presented by an institution to its student-athlete for bowl- or all-star game participation shall be subject to a separate \$300 limitation."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Events Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will specify that separate institutional awards limitations will apply to all-star games, similar to bowl-game awards.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 11 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES

Intent: To permit an institution to provide expenses to a student-athlete to participate in activities and events associated with "National Girls and Women in Sports Day," provided the activities and events are conducted in the state in which the institution is located or in Washington, D.C., as part of a national celebration

Bylaws: Amend 16.10.1 by adding new 16.10.1.8, page 198, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.10.1.8 National Girls and Women in Sports Day. An institution may pay actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to participate in activities and events associated with National Girls and Women in Sports Day, provided such activities and events are conducted either in the state in which the institution is located or in Wash-

ington, D.C., as part of a national celebration."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Women's Athletics).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: National Girls and Women in Sports Day is a significant event recognizing female athletes who have participated and excelled in athletics. As the Association approaches gender-equity concerns and encourages more female student-athletes to participate in intercollegiate athletics, it is important that student-athletes be able to attend recognition events of this nature.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 12 PHYSICAL-FITNESS CLASS

Intent: To delete the physical-fitness class as an activity not considered as practice.

Bylaws: Amend 17.02.12.2, pages 206-207, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.02.12.2 Activities Not Considered Practice. Practice shall not be considered to have occurred in the following activities:

[17.02.12.2-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Participation by student-athletes in a physical-fitness class conducted by a member of the athletics staff (including a member of the institution's coaching staff) under the following conditions:

"(1) Attendance by any student-athlete is voluntary.

"(2) The classes are open to any student of the institution;

"(3) Class hours and programs have been publicized in appropriate publications and/or on the proper bulletin boards of the institution.

"(4) Sessions are limited to a total of eight hours per week.

"(5) No equipment in the sport is used, including specialized shoes.

"(6) Teaching of fundamentals or techniques in the sport is prohibited.

"(7) Instruction in the sport is prohibited (including walking through offensive or defensive plays).

"(8) Showing of videos or movies for instruction in the sport is prohibited.

"(9) Class or activity sessions are conducted only in areas in which normal physical education activities or student recreation courses are conducted.

"(10) Organization of participants in the class or program, as well as any activities conducted therein, based upon player position(s) or offensive and defensive units is prohibited. In the sport of football, blocking dummies, machines, sleds and like equipment shall not be used, and contact and combative activities or drills of any kind (e.g., boxing, wrestling, basketball) shall be prohibited, and

"(11) In Division I only, a student-athlete attending a physical-fitness class during a summer term must be enrolled in at least one additional course for degree credit during that term."

[17.02.12.2-(c), relettered as 17.02.12.2-(b), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Inasmuch as a student-athlete's participation in a fit-

ness class conducted by an athletics department staff member is included in the institution's limits on countable athletically related activities per 17.02.1.1-(d), it is not necessary to specify that such a class does not constitute practice.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 13 HERITAGE BOWL

Intent: To specify that all members of the Mid-Eastern and Southwestern Athletic Conferences shall participate in the Division I-AA Football Championship, if eligible and selected for participation, and that members of those conferences that participate in the Division I-AA Football Championship shall not participate in the Heritage Bowl during the same year.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.4 and 17.7.5, pages 243-246, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"17.7.4 End of Playing Season. A member institution's last contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football shall not be played outside the traditional segment (Division III) or after the second Saturday or Sunday in December (Divisions I and II), except for the following:

[17.7.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Bowl Games, NCAA and NAIA Championships, International Competition and Heritage Bowl. One postseason game approved by the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee or those games played in the National Collegiate Division I-AA, Division II and Division III Football Championships; football contests played on a foreign tour certified by the member institution, or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics football championships. In Division I-AA only, a member institution's last contest also may include participation in the Heritage Bowl to be held between the conference champions representatives of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and the Southwestern Athletic Conference no earlier than the Monday after the conclusion of the National Collegiate Division I-AA Football Championship.

"17.7.4.1 Heritage Bowl Restrictions. All members of the Mid-Eastern and Southwestern Athletic Conferences shall participate in the Division I-AA Football Championship, if eligible and selected for participation, and members of those conferences that participate in the Division I-AA Football Championship also shall not participate in the Heritage Bowl during the same year.

[17.7.4.1, renumbered as 17.7.4.2, unchanged.]

"17.7.5 Number of Contests

[17.7.5.1 unchanged.]

"17.7.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of football contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-10):

[17.7.5.2-(a) and 17.7.5.2-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Heritage Bowl. Participation in the Heritage Bowl held between the conference champions **representatives** of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and Southwestern Athletic Conference, which shall meet the reporting requirements set forth in 30.9 in order to be exempt."

[Remainder of 17.7.5 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: These restrictions will ensure that the Heritage Bowl in no way conflicts with the Division I-AA Football Championship and is conducted consistent with the intent of the Division I-AA membership when it voted to establish the Heritage Bowl as an exempted contest in the sport of football.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 14 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS—GYMNASTICS

Intent: To substitute the United States Gymnastics Federation (USGF) and National College Gymnastics Association (NCGA) collegiate gymnastics championships for the NAIA gymnastics championships as an annual exemption.

Bylaws: Amend 17.9.4.2, page 255, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.9.4.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of gymnastics shall exclude the following:
[17.9.4.2-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) *NAIA USGF Collegiate and NCGA Championships. Competition in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) United States Gymnastics Federation (USGF) and National College Gymnastics Association (NCGA) collegiate gymnastics championships.*"

[Remainder of 17.9.4.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council; all members of the Pacific West Conference and Texas Woman's University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: There no longer is a Division II gymnastics championship for women, and the NAIA no longer sponsors a gymnastics championship. The United States Gymnastics Federation (USGF) and the National College Gymnastics Association (NCGA) provide national collegiate gymnastics championships for both men and women. Therefore, it is appropriate to substitute these gymnastics championships for the exemption currently specified in 17.9.4.2-(b).

Action: See No. 1.

Presidents Commission Grouping

[Note: The Presidents Commission designated the following 45 proposals for placement at this point in the agenda. Please note that inclusion of a proposal in this grouping does not constitute a position

by the Commission for or against the proposal; rather, the proposals are placed here because the Commission believes that they are of particular interest to chief executive officers. The only proposals officially sponsored by the Commission are identified with an asterisk before the proposal number. Please note also that the Commission designated all 45 proposals in this grouping for roll-call votes]

* NO. 15 NCAA ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

Intent: In Division I, to specify that once every five years, an institution shall complete a prescribed institutional self-study, verified and evaluated through an external peer-review process administered by an NCAA Committee on Athletics Certification.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.2.4 and 3.2.5, pages 9-11, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"3.2.4 Conditions and Obligations of Membership

[3.2.4.1 through 3.2.4.6 unchanged.]

"3.2.4.7 Athletics Certification. To meet the provisions of the athletics certification program of the Association, Division I member institutions shall complete, at least once every five years, an institutional self-study, verified and evaluated through external peer review, in accordance with the Association's constitution and bylaws.

[3.2.4.7 through 3.2.4.11, renumbered as 3.2.4.8 through 3.2.4.12, unchanged.]

"3.2.5 Loss of Active Membership

[3.2.5.1 through 3.2.5.4 unchanged.]

"3.2.5.5 Failure to Address Athletics Certification Problems. The Committee on Athletics Certification may place a Division I member institution in a restricted and/or corresponding membership category if it concludes that the institution has not addressed properly the problems identified pursuant to the athletics certification program of the Association."

[3.2.5.5 and 3.2.5.6, renumbered as 3.2.5.6 and 3.2.5.7, unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend 3.3.4 by adding new 3.3.4.2, page 12, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"3.3.4.2 Athletics Certification Program. Member conferences shall facilitate the athletics certification program of the Association in accordance with the Association's constitution and bylaws."

C. Bylaws. Amend 5.2.3 by adding new 5.2.3.4, page 32, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"5.2.3.4 Athletics Certification Policies and Procedures. The Committee on Athletics Certification is empowered to adopt or revise policies and procedures for the conduct of the Association's athletics certification program,

subject to approval by the Council. These policies and procedures shall be developed by the Committee on Athletics Certification, shall not be inconsistent with the provisions of the constitution and bylaws, and shall be subject to amendment by the membership."

- D. Constitution. Amend 6.01 by adding new 6.01.2 and 6.01.3, page 41, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"6.01.2 Athletics Certification — Verified and Evaluated Self-Study. The central purpose of the athletics certification program of the Association shall be to validate the fundamental integrity of member institutions' athletics programs through a verified and evaluated institutional self-study.

"6.01.3 External Peer Review. The involvement in the certification program of peer reviewers who are external to the institution is designed to verify and evaluate the methodology and results of the institutional self-study. Peer reviewers shall verify that the self-study process was characterized by campus-wide participation and that the self-study report reflects accurately the operation of the athletics program. Peer reviewers also shall evaluate the institution's athletics program in relation to a set of fundamental operating principles."

- E. Constitution: Amend 6.3.1 by adding new 6.3.1.1, page 43, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"6.3.1.1 Division I Athletics Certification Requirement. In Division I, the self-study requirement set forth in 6.3.1 shall consist of the completion of, at least once every five years, a prescribed institutional self-study verified and evaluated through external peer review. Subjects per 6.3.1 covered by the self-study shall be grouped as follows:

- "(a) Governance and commitment to rules compliance;
- "(b) Academic integrity;
- "(c) Fiscal integrity, and
- "(d) Commitment to equity.

"6.3.1.1.1 Institutional Plan for Improvement. Each member institution participating in the program shall develop a formal set of objectives designed to correct any deficiencies in the institution's athletics program, and establish an overall strategy for improving the quality of the institution's athletics program from one self-study to the next. When problems are identified pursuant to the certification process, a member institution shall take corrective action. A member institution that fails to conduct an appropriate self-study or to make an effective effort to correct problems identified pursuant to the certification process may be denied certification and ultimately may be placed in restricted and/or corresponding membership classifications."

[Note: If 6.3.1.1 is adopted, 6.3.1 will be amended editorially to clarify that Division I institutions shall use the athletics certification process to fulfill self-study requirements.]

- F. Bylaws: Amend 19.4, by adding new 19.4.4, page 327, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"19.4.4 Recommendation to Committee on Athletics Certification. The Committee on Infractions may recommend to the Committee on Athletics Certification that an institution's certification status be reviewed as a result of the institution's completed infractions case."

- G. Bylaws: Add new Bylaw 23, page 376, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION

"23.01 GENERAL PRINCIPLE

"The central purpose of the certification program of the Association shall be to validate the fundamental integrity of member institutions' athletics programs through a verified and evaluated institutional self-study. The involvement of peer reviewers external to the institution shall provide the verification and evaluation of the methodology and results of the self-study.

"23.1 COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION

"The Council shall appoint a Committee on Athletics Certification that shall be responsible for administration of the athletics certification program.

"23.1.1 Composition of Committee. The committee shall be composed of a minimum of 12 members and shall include chief executive officers, faculty athletics representatives, directors of athletics, senior women administrators and conference commissioners. All shall be on the staff of a Division I active member institution or member conference. One of the members shall serve as chair.

"23.1.1.1 Chair. The chair of the committee shall serve a two-year term and may not be reappointed as chair.

"23.1.1.2 Chair-Elect. The Council shall appoint a chair-elect, who will serve in the position for two years, at which time that individual will assume the chair position. The chair-elect shall have responsibilities specified by the Committee on Athletics Certification.

"23.1.2 Term of Office. A member of the committee shall serve a three-year term. Members may be reappointed for one additional term but shall not serve more than six years on the committee.

"23.1.3 Duties of Committee. The duties of the Com-

mittee on Athletics Certification shall be as follows:

- "(a) To establish a pool of peer reviewers;
- "(b) To select and assign peer-review teams to each institution;
- "(c) To determine the schedule of participating institutions;
- "(d) To modify and refine standards and procedures for the peer-review evaluation visit as necessary;
- "(e) To establish and maintain procedures for the preparation of peer-review team reports and the review-team chair's comments related to an institution's response to the report;
- "(f) To establish and maintain procedures for determining whether intermittent peer-review visits should be conducted as a result of changes in an institution (e.g., new personnel);
- "(g) To determine the certification status of member institutions, per 23.3, and
- "(h) To carry out any other duties directly related to the administration of the Association's athletics certification program."

"23.2 MANDATORY SELF-STUDY AND EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

"Each Division I member institution, at least once every five years, shall complete an institutional self-study, verified and evaluated through external peer review. The self-study shall encompass the following operating principles in four basic areas:

"23.2.1 Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance

"23.2.1.1 Institutional Mission. Maintaining intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program is a basic purpose of the Association. Consistent with this fundamental policy, the mission and goals of the athletics program shall:

- "(a) Appear in published form and be given wide circulation within the institution and among its external constituencies;
- "(b) Relate clearly to the mission and goals of the institution;
- "(c) Support the educational objectives and academic progress of student-athletes;
- "(d) Support equitable opportunity for all students and staff, including women and minorities;
- "(e) Result from a process of development and periodic review involving substantive participation by the major constituent groups of the institution, and

"(f) Be reflected in the actual practices of the institution's athletics program.

"23.2.1.2 Institutional Control. The Association's principle of institutional control vests in the institution the responsibility for the conduct of its athletics program, including the actions of its staff members and representatives of its athletics interests.

"23.2.1.3 Presidential Authority, Governing Board. The institution's governing board shall provide oversight and broad policy formulation. The chief executive officer shall be assigned ultimate responsibility and authority for the actual operation of the athletics program, with clear and direct support of the board.

"23.2.1.4 Shared Responsibilities. The athletics program shall be an integral part of the educational enterprise of the institution. As such, appropriate campus constituencies shall have the opportunity to provide input into the formulation of policies relating to the conduct of the athletics program and to scrutinize the implementation of such policies.

"23.2.1.5 Assignment of Rules-Compliance Responsibilities. The institution shall have in place a set of written policies and procedures that assign specific responsibilities in the area of rules compliance. In critical and sensitive areas, institutional compliance procedures shall provide for the regular participation of persons outside of the athletics department.

"23.2.1.6 Rules-Compliance Accountability. Rules compliance shall be the subject of an ongoing educational effort, and the commitment to rules compliance shall be a central element in personnel decisions within the department of intercollegiate athletics.

"23.2.2 Academic Integrity

"23.2.2.1 Student-Athletes Integrated in Student Body. An intercollegiate athletics program shall be designed to be a vital part of the institution's educational system, and student-athletes shall be considered an integral part of the student body.

"23.2.2.2 Admissions and Graduation. The institution shall admit only student-athletes who have reasonable expectations of obtaining academic degrees. If the graduation rate of student-athletes is significantly lower than that of the rest of the student body, this disparity shall be analyzed, explained and addressed (through specific plans for improvement) by appropriate institutional authorities under clearly established and

approved policies. If the academic profile of entering student-athletes differs from that of the rest of the student body, the contrast shall be analyzed and explained by regular institutional authorities under clearly established and approved policies.

"23.2.2.3 Academic Authority. The responsibility for admission, certification of academic standing and evaluation of academic performance of student-athletes shall be vested in the same agencies that have authority in these matters for students generally.

"23.2.2.4 Academic Support. Adequate academic support services shall be available for student-athletes. Student-athletes shall be encouraged and assisted in reaching attainable academic goals of their own choosing. When it is determined that individual student-athletes have special academic needs, these needs shall be addressed. The support services shall be approved and reviewed periodically by academic authorities outside the department of intercollegiate athletics.

"23.2.2.5 Scheduling. The scheduling of athletics competition and practice shall minimize conflicts between athletics participation and academic schedules, especially during examination periods.

"23.2.3 Fiscal Integrity

"23.2.3.1 Financial Controls. Institutional financing of intercollegiate athletics shall follow prudent management and fiscal practices and provide relatively full and stable opportunities for student-athletes. All funds raised for and expended on athletics shall be subject to generally accepted practices of documentation, review and oversight. In addition, all expenditures from any source for athletics shall be approved by the institution. Budget and audit procedures for athletics shall be consistent with those followed by the institution generally and with the provisions of Constitution 6.2, which require that the institution's annual budget for athletics be approved by the institution's chief executive officer or designee from outside the athletics department, and that a financial audit be performed by a qualified auditor who is not a staff member of the institution and who is selected by the chief executive officer or designee from outside the athletics department.

"23.2.3.2 Established Policies and Procedures. The institution shall have in place policies and standard operating procedures to ensure that all expenditures for athletics are handled consistent-

ly in accordance with NCAA rules.

"23.2.4 Commitment to Equity

"23.2.4.1 Gender Issues. An institution shall demonstrate that in the area of intercollegiate athletics, it is committed to fair and equitable treatment of both men and women. It shall have available adequate information for assessing its current progress in this area and an institutional plan for addressing it in the future. The plan shall provide for accommodating the evolving standards of the Association in the area of gender equity.

"23.2.4.2 Minority Issues. An institution shall demonstrate that in the area of intercollegiate athletics, it is committed to providing equitable opportunities for minority students, faculty and staff. It shall have available adequate information for assessing its current progress in this area and an institutional plan for addressing it in the future. The plan shall provide for accommodating the evolving standards of the Association in the area of minority issues.

"23.2.4.3 Student-Athlete Welfare. The institution shall demonstrate a commitment to the fair treatment of student-athletes, particularly in their academic role as students. There shall be evidence that the welfare of student-athletes and the fairness of their treatment is monitored, evaluated and addressed on a continuing basis.

"23.3 CERTIFICATION DECISIONS

"The Committee on Athletics Certification shall base its decisions regarding the certification of an institution's athletics program on information contained in the institution's self-study report, the peer-review team's written report, the institution's written response to the review team's report, written comments by the review team in relation to the institution's response, and evidence presented at hearings or in-person appearances before the committee. Actions of the Committee on Athletics Certification regarding an institution's certification status shall be announced publicly.

"23.3.1 Categories of Certification. Based on the information presented, the Committee on Athletics Certification shall determine an institution's certification status consistent with the following three categories:

"23.3.1.1 Certified. A certified institution shall have been deemed to be in substantial conformity with the operating principles in 23.2.

"23.3.1.2 Certified with Conditions. An institution that is certified with conditions shall have been deemed to be in substantial conformity with the operating principles in 23.2, subject to the institu-

tion's fulfillment of certain corrective actions in a reasonable, specified period of time. An institution may evidence fulfillment of these corrective actions prior to the time specified by the committee.

"23.3.1.3 Not Certified. An institution that is not certified shall have been deemed to be not in substantial conformity with the operating principles in 23.2 and shall be subject to the fulfillment of certain corrective actions in a reasonable, specified period of time. An institution may evidence fulfillment of these corrective actions prior to the time specified by the committee.

"23.3.2 Postponement of Certification Decision. The committee reserves the right to postpone the certification decision of an institution when its self-study is deemed to be inadequate (e.g., lacking accuracy, openness or campus-wide participation). If the institution does not respond, it may be placed in restricted-membership status. Such an institution shall not be eligible for certification until an appropriate self-study is completed.

"23.3.3 Corrective Action. When problems are identified pursuant to the athletics certification process, a member institution shall take corrective action. Requirements for taking corrective action, and a record of such action, shall be a routine aspect of the certification process and shall be available for review during subsequent certifications.

"23.3.3.1 Demonstration of Fulfillment of Corrective Action. The Committee on Athletics Certification shall require institutions to demonstrate that corrective actions identified by the committee have been taken in the specified period of time and, upon such a showing, shall grant the institution full certification status.

"23.3.3.2 Failure to Take Corrective Actions. An institution that fails to conduct an appropriate self-study or to make an effective effort to correct problems in its athletics program may be denied certification following the expiration of a reasonable, specified period of time during which the institution may rectify its deficiencies.

"23.3.3.2.1 Not Certified — Restricted Membership. If, following the expiration of the time period specified in 23.3.3.2, the Committee on Athletics Certification determines that serious problems remain in the institution's athletics program, the institution shall be placed in a restricted-membership category, consistent with the provisions of 20.3.5.1.

"23.3.3.2.2 Not Certified — Corresponding

Membership. If, at the end of the restricted-membership year specified in 23.3.3.2.1, the Committee on Athletics Certification concludes that the concerns cited previously related to the institution's athletics department still are not being addressed properly, the institution shall be reclassified as a corresponding member, consistent with the provisions of Constitution 3.5 and Bylaw 20.3.5.1.1.

"23.3.4 Action on Referrals From Committee on Infractions. The Committee on Athletics Certification may review and alter an institution's certification status upon referral from the Committee on Infractions per 19.4.4.

"23.3.5 Appeals. Following a hearing before the Committee on Athletics Certification, an institution may appeal the decision of the Committee on Athletics Certification pursuant to this section to the Division I Steering Committee (see Bylaw 33 for hearing procedures).

"23.4 CONFERENCE ASSISTANCE

"Conference offices may assist member institutions in the regular review of the institution's commitment to compliance with the rules of the Association and in the development and maintenance of institutional compliance objectives and strategies. Conference records of ongoing institutional compliance efforts shall be subject to review by the peer-review team. Conferences also may serve as facilitators in the certification process, linking participating institutions and external review teams as follows:

"(a) Participating in the orientation process for institutions scheduled for review;

"(b) Accompanying peer-review teams on campus visits of conference members, and

"(c) Ensuring that conference members develop, implement and report corrective actions identified as a normal part of the certification process.

"23.5 OTHER ASSISTANCE

"An institution may obtain other assistance in carrying out the responsibilities specific to athletics certification set forth in Bylaw 23.4, subject to the prior approval of the Committee on Athletics Certification."

H. Bylaws: Add new Bylaw 33, page 437 as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION

"Preamble

"Athletics certification policies and procedures are adopted or revised by the Committee on Athletics Certification, subject to approval by the Council (see 5.2.3.4). They must be consistent with the provisions of the constitution and bylaws and may be amended at any annual or

special Convention. Since the athletics certification policies and procedures apply only to Division I, they require, for amendment, a majority vote of Division I.

"33.1 SELF-STUDY AND EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

"The requirements and procedures set forth in this bylaw apply to the institutional self-study and athletics certification process specified in Constitution 3 and 6 and Bylaw 23.

"33.2 EXTERNAL PEER-REVIEW TEAMS

"33.2.1 Function. External peer-review teams shall be responsible for reviewing the institution's self-study report, conducting campus visits and offering comments to the review team's chair. The peer-review team shall approach the institution's self-study report and the campus visit with two objectives:

"(a) To verify that the self-study process involved campus-wide participation, and that the self-study report reflects accurately the operation of the institution's athletics program, and

"(b) To evaluate the institution's performance in relation to the fundamental operating principles specified in 23.2.

"33.2.2 Composition. External peer-review teams shall be established to ensure that participating member institutions are evaluated by broadly representative teams composed of experienced educational and athletics personnel with substantial campus experience. Peer-review teams shall consist of three to five peer reviewers. Peer-review team members shall be appointed by the Committee on Athletics Certification and represent institutions in Division I. One NCAA staff member shall accompany and support each team on evaluation site visits.

"33.2.3 Selection and Assignment of Peer-Review Teams

"33.2.3.1 Opportunity of Institution to Review List of Potential Peer Reviewers. Prior to the establishment of a peer-review team and the appointment of its chair, an institution shall be given the opportunity to review a list of potential peer reviewers and chairs for purposes of removing those who seem inappropriate or unacceptable to the institution.

"33.2.3.2 Establishment of Team. As a general rule, peer-review teams shall be established according to the needs, size and subdivision of the institution to be reviewed, and the coverage of topic areas, without regard to the specific constituent groups with which individual peer reviewers are identified.

"33.2.3.2.1 'Pool' of Peer Reviewers

"33.2.3.2.1.1 Basic Qualifications. To be included in the pool of peer reviewers, an individual shall be from a Division I institution or conference and shall have a general knowledge of intercollegiate athletics (as evidenced by positions held, committee service, etc.), and

"(a) Hold the position of chief executive officer, faculty athletics representative, director of athletics or senior woman administrator at a member institution (although recent retirees may be included in the pool under special circumstances), or

"(b) Have recognized expertise, skills or experience in particular areas addressed in the certification program (e.g., compliance coordinator, business manager, admissions officer, registrar, financial aid administrator, vice-president for fiscal or academic affairs, vice-president overseeing athletics).

"33.2.3.2.1.2 Women and Ethnic Minorities. The pool of peer reviewers shall include sufficient numbers of women and members of ethnic groups to ensure their frequent assignment to peer-review teams.

"33.2.3.3 Modification of Composition of Team by Chair of Team. The chair of the peer-review team, in consultation with the NCAA staff and the institution, shall have the authority to modify the composition of the team on the basis of the preliminary analysis of the self-study report.

"33.2.3.4 Conflict of Interest. Former and current employees, consultants or alumni shall not be assigned as peer reviewers to an institution with which they are so affiliated. Further, an individual shall not be allowed to serve as a peer reviewer of an institution that is in the same conference as the individual's conference.

"33.2.3.5 Peer-Review Team Chair. The review team's chair shall be one of the peer reviewers. The chair shall be responsible for preparing the team's written recommendation(s) regarding certification. The recommendation(s) shall be based upon the breadth of institutional participation and the depth of discussion at the institution level, and adherence to the program's broad operating principles. The review team's chair also shall represent the team before the Committee on Athletics Certification and during appeals hearings.

"33.2.4 Techniques and Documentation Used by Peer-Review Team. The review team shall employ traditional evaluative techniques (e.g., review existing records, conduct in-person interviews of key personnel) to determine whether the institution's stated policies and procedures are engaged and functioning. Three documents also shall be of primary importance in this process:

- "(a) The self-study instrument itself, which shall be completed by the institution for review by the external peer-review team;
- "(b) A user's guide, which shall assist the institution through the self-study process, with specific attention to appropriate campus involvement and particular topics on which the institution shall focus, and
- "(c) Instructions for peer-review teams, to orient team members in their work, including the review of written documents and appropriate topics for discussion in campus interviews.

"33.3 CERTIFICATION SCHEDULE OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

"33.3.1 Determination of Schedule. The Committee on Athletics Certification shall determine the certification schedule, which shall be based on the following principles, insofar as is practicable:

- "(a) Institutions from the same conference should be evenly scheduled throughout the certification cycle so as to reduce the burden on the conference office.
- "(b) Conferences may suggest a schedule for their member institutions.
- "(c) Certification should be scheduled in conjunction with the institution's regional accreditation insofar as is possible for those institutions that so desire.
- "(d) When the above principles are not operative, procedures of random selection will be utilized.

"33.3.1.1 Certification Schedule for New Division I Members. New Division I members shall be scheduled as soon as practicable after the effective date of their active membership.

"33.3.1.2 Modification of Schedule. An institution may apply to the Committee on Athletics Certification for modification of its place in the schedule upon a showing of special need (e.g., a new chief executive officer or director of athletics is appointed, the institution is involved in an NCAA investigation). The committee shall, at its discretion, revise the schedule if practicable, provided the modification does not extend beyond the certification program's initial five-year period.

"33.3.1.3 Postponement of Certification for Restricted Members Involved in NCAA Investigations. The Committee on Athletics Certification may, at its discretion, delay or postpone the participation of an institution classified in a restricted-membership status or of an institution that is subject to the discontinuation of a sport(s) program(s) as a result of NCAA repeat-violator penalties, when the committee determines it is in the best interests of the Association to do so.

"33.4 SELF-STUDY PROCESS AND REPORT PROCEDURES

"33.4.1 Time Period for Beginning and Completing Self-Study. Institutions shall be permitted at least one calendar year to complete their certification self-studies and shall be permitted to begin their self-studies at any time.

"33.4.2 Use of Outside Consultants. Institutions shall not be prohibited from using outside consultants in conducting self-studies (e.g., organizing or facilitating an institution's self-study process). However, the institution's own personnel shall be responsible for generating the substance of the self-study report. Peer-review teams shall evaluate institutions on their role in the development of the content of self-study reports.

"33.4.3 Submission of Self-Study Report. Institutions shall be required to submit self-study reports and any supporting documentation to the NCAA staff sufficiently in advance of the evaluation visit. The peer-review team shall perform a preliminary analysis of the report based upon directives or criteria established by the Committee on Athletics Certification. The chair of the peer-review team shall have the authority to determine whether to accept the report. Any decisions to delay the processing of a report shall be made only after consulting with NCAA staff members and with the chair of the Committee on Athletics Certification.

"33.4.4 Confidentiality of Report. Institutional self-study reports shall be treated as confidential by the NCAA, peer-review teams and the Committee on Athletics Certification. Institutions, however, shall be permitted to distribute reports and supporting documentation at their discretion.

"33.5 ORIENTATION VISIT

"An NCAA staff member shall make an orientation visit to each institution at least one year in advance of the institution's initial scheduled evaluation site visit. The primary purpose of the orientation visit shall be to discuss with institutional and conference personnel the purpose, process, implications and expectations of the certification program.

"33.5.1 Conference Role. Conference staff representatives may accompany NCAA staff members on orientation visits at conference expense.

"33.6 PEER-REVIEW EVALUATION VISIT

"33.6.1 Purpose of Visit. The primary purpose of the evaluation visit shall be to verify and evaluate the institution's self-study report and self-study process.

"33.6.2 Notice of Visit. An institution shall receive notice at least one year in advance of its evaluation visit.

"33.6.3 Duties of Chair of Peer-Review Team. The chair of the peer-review team shall be responsible for at least the following duties in conjunction with evaluation visits:

- "(a) Consulting with NCAA staff on arrangements and preparations for evaluation visits;
- "(b) Delegating tasks to be performed during the visit among team members and staff, in accordance with their areas of expertise;
- "(c) Conducting meetings of the visiting team at the end of each day of the visit to summarize findings and to identify remaining tasks to be performed;
- "(d) Meeting with an institution's chief executive officer to discuss informally the nature of the information to be presented in the exit interview;
- "(e) Coordinating and leading the exit interview at the completion of the visit;
- "(f) Communicating with the peer-review team following the visit to clarify conclusions for the written report;
- "(g) Ensuring that the peer-review team's report is reflective of the visit's findings and recommendations, and is submitted to the Committee on Athletics Certification following the visit;
- "(h) Communicating with the Committee on Athletics Certification regarding the evaluation visit and peer-review team report, including appearing in person, if necessary, before the committee regarding an institution's certification status;
- "(i) Evaluating the performance of the peer reviewers serving on the teams, and
- "(j) Otherwise ensuring that the team fulfills its responsibilities and the objectives specified for evaluation visits.

"33.6.4 Conference Role. Conference staff representatives may accompany peer-review teams on evaluation visits at the conference's expense. The role of the conference during the visit shall be determined on a case-by-case basis by the chair of the peer-review team in consultation with the conference.

"33.6.5 Exit Interviews. The entire peer-review team

shall participate in an exit interview with the chief executive officer and other individuals invited by the chief executive officer.

"33.6.6 Rules Violations Discovered During Evaluation Visit. Possible violations of NCAA rules discovered during evaluation visits shall be communicated to the committee, the institution and the conference in the peer-review team's report. The institution shall be reminded of its obligation to self-report violations per Constitution 2.5.1. The institution's response to these findings shall be a factor in the certification decision.

"33.6.7 Release of Information Regarding Evaluation Visit. Until the Committee on Athletics Certification renders its decision, information released regarding evaluation visits shall be limited to statements of the visit's status (i.e., whether the visit has not been made, is in progress or has been completed) and the identities of peer-review team members assigned to the institution. Before the formal assessment, the NCAA, peer-review team and the institution shall not publicize information regarding the visit and shall respond only to inquiries with the public information just described. Following release of the committee's decision, the institution is at liberty to release any information regarding the visit.

"33.7 REPORT OF PEER-REVIEW TEAM

"33.7.1 Submission of Report. The peer-review team's report shall be submitted by the chair of the team to the Committee on Athletics Certification as soon as practicable following the evaluation visit. A copy of the report, excluding the review team's recommendation regarding the institution's certification status, also shall be provided to the chief executive officer of the institution and to the institution's conference.

"33.7.2 Content of Report. The peer-review team's report shall include the following:

- "(a) An evaluation of the institution's self-study process as to openness, thoroughness and breadth of participation;
- "(b) An evaluation of the institution's adherence to the certification program's operating principles;
- "(c) A summary of perceived relative strengths and weaknesses in the institution's athletics program, and
- "(d) A recommendation regarding the institution's certification status, based solely upon the information included in the peer-review team's report.

"33.7.3 Institutional Reaction to Report. The institution may submit a written reaction to the peer-review report. It shall be sent to the Committee on Athletics Certification (with a copy to the chair of the peer-

review team) and shall be limited to correction of factual errors; the presentation of new, relevant information not considered by the team, and proposed corrective actions for remedying deficiencies.

"33.7.3.1 Response of Peer-Review Team to Institutional Reaction. If the institution submits a reaction to the peer-review report, the chair of the peer-review team shall be asked to provide the Committee on Athletics Certification with the team's response to the institution's reaction, including the institution's proposed plan for improvement.

"33.8 CERTIFICATION DECISION

"33.8.1 Basis of Certification Decision. The certification decisions of the Committee on Athletics Certification shall be based upon the criteria set forth in 23.3.

"33.8.2 Appearance by Institutional Representatives. At the request of the committee, institutional representatives may be asked to appear in person to clarify factual discrepancies and other matters at the time the committee is rendering its certification decision.

"33.8.3 Request for Hearing. The committee shall be obligated to honor an institution's request for a hearing upon notification to the institution that it is being placed in restricted- or corresponding-membership status.

"33.8.4 Announcement of Certification Decision. The committee, after notifying the institution of its certification decision (and before final appeals are heard), will publicize the institution's name and the committee's decision regarding the institution's certification status through a standard press-release-type report. While other information related to the peer-review team's report or the Committee on Athletics Certification's actions shall be considered confidential between the institution and the NCAA, the institution may release information regarding the committee's decision at its own discretion."

- I. Bylaws: Amend 21.3 by adding new 21.3.4, page 361, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"21.3.4 Athletics Certification, Committee on. The Committee on Athletics Certification shall be appointed as provided in 23.1 and its duties assigned as set forth in 23.1.3. (See Bylaws 23 and 33 for details regarding the committee and the Association's procedures related to athletics certification.)"

- J. Bylaws: Amend 14.9.1.2, pages 158-159, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"14.9.1.2 Residence Requirement. The one-year residence

requirement for student-athletes may be waived under the following conditions or circumstances:

[14.9.1.2-(a) through 14.9.1.2-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) On the recommendation of the Committee on Athletics Certification for a student-athlete who transfers to a member institution to continue the student-athlete's opportunity for full participation in a sport because the student-athlete's original institution, per Bylaw 23.3.3, is placed in a membership category that would preclude the institution's team in that sport from participating in postseason competition during all of the remaining seasons of the student-athlete's eligibility."

Source: NCAA Council Special Committee on Athletics Certification) and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: Part I effective immediately; remaining sections effective January 1, 1994.

Rationale: Athletics certification is an extension of the current NCAA required self-study. The program provides a realistic opportunity for the institution's larger community to be informed regarding important policy matters in athletics. The involvement of external peer-review teams, composed of experienced campus administrators, will promote campus-wide participation in the institution's self-study and permit an evaluation of the athletics program in terms of fundamental operating principles. These principles are defined broadly to recognize the diversity of member institutions. Certification also will be coordinated with related programs already in place. Required NCAA reports (e.g., graduation-rates disclosure, financial audits) form the bulk of requested data, and working relationships have been established with regional accrediting agencies to reduce the combined burdens on campus personnel who deal with both kinds of programs. The primary results of athletics certification for each institution should be the establishment of an overall strategy for improving the quality of the athletics program from one self-study to the next and the development of a formal set of objectives designed to correct deficiencies in the institution's athletics program.

Action: Parts A through H, as amended by 15-1 and 15-2, adopted by Division I (274-41, four abstentions). Part I adopted by Division I (311-10, two abstentions). Division II (186-7, four abstentions) and Division III (212-6, 20 abstentions). Part J adopted by Division I (310-11, one abstention), Division II (192-7, two abstentions) and Division III (239-2, 17 abstentions), roll-call votes.

NO. 15-1 NCAA ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

Intent: To eliminate the position of chair-elect on the proposed Committee on Athletics Certification.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 15-G, 23.1.1.2, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"23.1.1.2 Chair-Elect. The Council shall appoint a chair-elect, who will serve in the posi-

tion for two years, at which time that individual will assume the chair position. The chair-elect shall have responsibilities specified by the Committee on Athletics Certification."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Athletics Certification).

Rationale: The Committee on Athletics Certification should have the flexibility to permit a committee member to become familiar with the duties of the chair and to assist the chair in performing those duties on a more informal basis.

Action: Adopted by Division I (289-14, two abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 15-2 NCAA ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

Intent: To clarify that "faculty and staff" in the area of intercollegiate athletics refers to institutional personnel in an institution's intercollegiate athletics program.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 15-G, 23.2.4.2, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"23.2.4.2 Minority Issues. An institution shall demonstrate that in the area of intercollegiate athletics, it is committed to providing equitable opportunities for minority students, *faculty and staff institutional personnel*. It shall have available adequate information for assessing its current progress in this area and an institutional plan for addressing it in the future. The plan shall provide for accommodating the evolving standards of the Association in the area of minority issues."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Athletics Certification).

Rationale: This amendment allays concerns that certification extends beyond a review of athletics to a review of institutional policies regarding faculty and staff in general. It clarifies the intent of the Special Committee of Athletics Certification that the operating principle only encompasses students and personnel associated with the athletics program.

Action: Adopted by Division I (302-6, one abstention), roll-call vote.

NO. 15-3 NCAA ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

Intent: To expand the membership of the proposed Committee on Athletics Certification to include a financial aid administrator, a registrar, an admissions official and a chief financial officer.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 15-G, 23.1.1, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"23.1.1 Composition of Committee. The committee shall be composed of a minimum of 12 members and shall include chief executive officers, faculty athletics representatives, directors of athletics, senior women administrators, and conference commissioners, **a financial aid administrator, a registrar, an admissions official and a chief financial officer.** All shall be on the staff of a Division I active member institution or member conference. One of the members shall serve as chair."

[Remainder of 23.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Southland Conference.

Rationale: The Committee on Athletics Certification is charged with the responsibility of administering the certification program and should consist of representatives with responsibilities similar to those of the individuals who will participate in the self-study and act as external peer reviewers.

Action: Defeated by Division I (71-242, four abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 15-4 NCAA ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

Intent: To specify that the initial athletics certification shall be within the first five years from the effective date of the proposal, and that the interval between subsequent certifications shall increase from five to 10 years.

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 15-A, 3.2.4.7, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"3.2.4.7 Athletics Certification. To meet the provisions of the athletics certification program of the Association, Division I member institutions shall complete, *at least once every five years*, **within five years of the effective date of this legislation and once every 10 years thereafter** an institutional self-study, verified and evaluated through external peer review, in accordance with the Association's constitution and bylaws."

[If No. 15-4 is adopted, other sections of the legislation related to the once-in-five-year period will be amended accordingly.]

Source: All members of the Patriot League.

Rationale: With other certification and accreditation requirements placed on all educational institutions, an athletics certification effort is not needed (after the first one) at any greater interval than 10 years. This would allow flexibility to integrate subsequent regional accreditation self-studies within the athletics certification process.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 15-5 NCAA ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

Intent: To delay the effective date of the Association's proposed athletics certification program until January 1, 1996.

[Division I only, roll call]

"Effective Date: Part I effective immediately; remaining sections effective January 1, **1994 1996.**"

Source: Brigham Young University; California State University, Fresno; Colorado State University; Kent State University; McNeese State University; Miami University (Ohio); University of New Mexico; Ohio University; San Diego State University; University of South Carolina, Columbia; University of Texas, Arlington; University of Texas, El Paso, and Vanderbilt University.

Rationale: The sponsors believe the proposed certification legislation ultimately should be implemented, but only after the membership has had an opportunity to study the process and make further refinements.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 16 RESOLUTION: NCAA ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION

[Division I only, roll call]

"Whereas, the athletics certification process is a commendable goal for the NCAA's Division I membership, and

"Whereas, 1993 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 15 contains several elements, including a peer-review process and a commitment-to-equity requirement, not contained in the original pilot certification programs completed by several member institutions; and

"Whereas, the mechanics of the proposed certification program should be tested thoroughly prior to their mandatory utilization by the membership;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council be directed to implement a pilot project to be conducted during the 1993-94 and 1994-95 academic years, utilizing the certification procedures specified in Proposal No. 15, in order to refine further the certification process and to make any necessary adjustments for consideration at the Association's 1996 Convention."

Source: Brigham Young University; Colorado State University; California State University, Fresno; McNeese State University; San Diego State University; University of Texas, Arlington; University of Texas, El Paso, and Vanderbilt University.

Action: Not moved.

NO. 17 INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY CLEARINGHOUSE

Intent: To specify that the fulfillment of academic credentials necessary to receive an official visit prior to an early signing period in Division I, and the fulfillment of the Association's freshman academic requirements in Divisions I and II, shall be certified by an initial-eligibility clearinghouse approved by the Council.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.1.2.4, pages 103-104, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"13.7.1.2.4 Academic Credentials for Official Visit Prior to Early Signing Period. A Division I member institution may not provide an expense-paid visit to a prospective student-athlete in a sport that has an early signing period for the National Letter of Intent prior to the initial early signing date in that sport if the prospect has not presented the institution with a minimum combined SAT score of 700 or a minimum composite ACT score of 17, and also has presented a minimum 2.000 grade-point average in at least seven core courses (per 14.3.1.1). **The prospect's fulfillment of these academic requirements shall be certified by an initial-eligibility clearinghouse approved by the Council.** A prospective student-athlete in the applicable sports who does not present these academic credentials shall not begin an official visit until 24 hours after the last day of the early signing period in that sport."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.1.2 by adding new 14.1.2.1, page 122, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.1.2.1 A Division I or II institution shall utilize an initial-eligibility clearinghouse approved by the Council to determine the validity of the information on which the initial eligibility of a student-athlete is based."

C. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1, page 130, as follows.

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.3.1 Eligibility for Financial Aid, Practice and Competition. A student-athlete who enrolls in a Division I or Division II institution as an entering freshman with no previous full-time college attendance shall meet the following academic requirements, as **certified by an initial-eligibility clearinghouse approved by the Council**, and any applicable institutional and conference regulations, to be considered a qualifier and thus be eligible for financial aid, practice and competition during the first academic year in residence."

Source: NCAA Council (Subcommittee to Review the Concept of Establishing an Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse).

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The establishment of an initial-eligibility clearinghouse will benefit Divisions I and II in three important ways. First, the clearinghouse will ensure that the interpretation and application of the Association's initial-eligibility legislation occur on a more consistent basis. This will help to create a more level "playing field" in the recruitment and certification of prospective student-athletes. Second, the clearinghouse will generate substantial cost and time savings at the institutional level by eliminating duplicate certification efforts by member institutions and transferring certification responsibilities to clearinghouse administrators. High-school administrators also will benefit directly from this reduced administrative burden. Third, the clearinghouse will create an invaluable data base that will permit the Association to study the effects of its initial- and continuing-eligibility legislation in greater detail. The time frame to establish the clearinghouse is realistic and will permit the clearinghouse to operate for a full academic year prior to the effective date of the Association's new initial-eligibility standards. Further, every effort has been made to contain the costs associated with the establishment and operation of the clearinghouse.

Action: Part A adopted by Division I (290-30, three abstentions), roll-call vote. Parts B and C adopted by Division I (291-18, three abstentions) and Division II (180-28), roll-call votes.

NO. 18 DISTRIBUTION OF GRADUATION-RATE REPORT

Intent: To require the NCAA, rather than member institutions, to provide information from the graduation-rate disclosure report to prospects' guidance offices and high-school and two-year college coaches by sending a compilation of graduation rates to the nation's high schools and two-year colleges

Bylaws: Amend 13.3.1.2, page 98, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"13.3.1.2 Report Distribution. Member institutions shall provide to prospects, and to prospects' parents, to prospects' guidance offices and to prospects' high-school and two-year college coaches the information contained within the report. **The NCAA shall provide a compilation of graduation data to the prospects' guidance offices and high-school and two-year college coaches.** The information shall be provided at the earliest opportunity during the recruiting process or upon request; however, in no event shall an institution provide the information later than the day prior to a prospect's signed acceptance of the National Letter of Intent or signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid."

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference, Boston College and University of Connecticut.

Effective Date: Immediately, effective with the publication of the Association's 1992-93 Graduation-Rates Report.

Rationale: This legislation was amended in January 1992 to include guidance offices in the distribution of graduation-rate information. This requires institutions to provide four individual copies of the graduation-rate report — one to each party designated (i.e., the prospect, the prospect's parents, the coach and the guidance counselor). It would not be permissible to send only one copy to the high school or two-year college for that institution's guidance office and coach. It makes more sense for the national office to send one compilation to the high schools and two-year colleges, rather than for institutions to send multiple individual copies. The sponsors believe that this proposal still would meet the public disclosure intent of the legislation. (Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$151,000.)

Action: Adopted by Division I (209-111, two abstentions) and Division II upon reconsideration (169-39, two abstentions), roll-call votes.

NO. 19 INITIAL ELIGIBILITY—CORE-CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS

Intent: To specify that the two years of mathematics required to fulfill the Association's core-curriculum requirements must consist of one year of algebra and one year of geometry and to increase from three to four the required years of English core courses.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1.1, page 131, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.1.1.1 Division I. A qualifier in Division I is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following academic qualifications:

"(a) A minimum cumulative grade-point average as specified in 14.3.1.1.1.1 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 13 academic courses per 14.3.1.2, including the following:

English	3 4 years
Mathematics	2 years

(1 year of algebra and 1 year of geometry)

Natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory course, if offered by the high school)	2 years
Additional courses in English, mathe- matics or natural or physical science	2 1 years
Social science	2 years
Additional academic courses [in any of the above areas or for- eign language, computer science, philosophy or nondoctrinal religion (e.g., comparative religion) courses]	2 years"

[Remainder of 14.3.1.1.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1.2, page 132, as follows:
[Division II only, roll call]

"14.3.1.1.2 Division II. In Division II, a qualifier is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following academic qualifications:

"(a) A minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 13 academic courses per 14.3.1.2, including the following:

English	3 4 years
Mathematics	2 years
(1 year of algebra and 1 year of geometry)	
Natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory course, if offered by the high school)	2 years
Additional courses in English, mathe- matics or natural or physical science	2 1 years
Social science	2 years
Additional academic courses [in any of the above areas or for- eign language, computer science, philosophy or nondoctrinal religion (e.g., comparative religion) courses]	2 years"

[Remainder of 14.3.1.1.2 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.2, pages 132-133, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"(a) English — (three **four** years required). Core courses in English shall include instructional elements in the following areas: grammar, vocabulary development, composition, literature, analytical reading or oral communication.

"(b) Mathematics — (two years required, **including at least one year of algebra and one year of geometry**). Core courses in mathematics shall include instructional elements in algebra, geometry, trigonometry, statistics (algebra-based) or calculus.

[14.3.1.2-(c), 14.3.1.2-(d) and 14.3.1.2-(e) unchanged.]

"(f) Additional Academic Courses — (two **one** years required). The **two one** remaining years of additional academic credit must be from courses in the above areas or foreign language, computer science, philosophy or nondoctrinal religion (e.g., comparative religion) courses."

[Remainder of 14.3.1.2 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering collegiate institutions on or after August 1, 1996.

Rationale: This proposal enhances the Association's initial-eligibility standards by strengthening the core-curriculum requirements in an effort to better prepare student-athletes for success in college. This proposal will encourage prospects to take a more rigorous academic curriculum in high school. It is supported by the results of a College Board study that shows that the graduation rates for minorities and lower-income students are greater for students who have completed a course in geometry.

Action: Adopted by Division I (169-145, six abstentions); defeated by Division II (39-171), roll-call votes.

NO. 20 INITIAL ELIGIBILITY—CORE-CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS

Intent: To permit foreign language to be included as one of the two additional courses necessary to fulfill the Association's core-curriculum requirements.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1.1, page 131, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.1.1.1 Division I. A qualifier in Division I is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following academic qualifications:

"(a) A minimum cumulative grade-point average as specified in 14.3.1.1.1 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 13 academic courses per 14.3.1.2, including the following:

English	3 years
Mathematics	2 years
Natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory course, if offered by the high school)	2 years
Additional courses in English, mathematics, foreign language or natural or physical science	2 years
Social science	2 years
Additional academic courses [in any of the above areas or for- eign language, computer science, philosophy or nondoctrinal religion (e.g., comparative religion) courses]	2 years"

[Remainder of 14.3.1.1.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1.2, page 132, as follows:
[Division II only, roll call]

"14.3.1.1.2 Division II. In Division II, a qualifier is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following academic qualifications:

"(a) A minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 13 academic courses per 14.3.1.2, including the following:

English	3 years
Mathematics	2 years
Natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory course, if offered by the high school)	2 years
Additional courses in English, mathe- matics, foreign language or nat- ural or physical science	2 years
Social science	2 years
Additional academic course [in any of the above areas or for- eign language, computer science, philosophy or nondoctrinal religion (e.g., comparative religion) courses]	2 years"

[Remainder of 14.3.1.1.2 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.2, pages 132-133, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]
[14.3.1.2-(a) through 14.3.1.2-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Additional Courses in English, Mathematics, **Foreign Language** or Natural or Physical Science — (two years required). Two years of additional academic credit must be from courses in the above areas of English, mathematics, **foreign language** or natural or physical science."

[14.3.1.2-(f) unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference, University of Connecticut and Georgetown University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1995; for those student-athletes first entering collegiate institutions on or after August 1, 1995.

Rationale: This amendment adds foreign language to the menu of the two years of additional required core courses. The study of a foreign language in the precollege years is an important basis for the further study of languages and foreign cultures in college, just as the study of English, mathematics and science in high school helps students with the advanced study of these subjects in college. Increasingly, colleges are adding two years of a foreign language as a prerequisite for regular admission. This will further enhance the goal for which the core-curriculum requirement was added to the NCAA freshman-eligibility requirements.

Action: Defeated by Division I (153-168, two abstentions) and Divi-

NO. 21 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Intent: To increase from 24 to 27 semester hours and from 36 to 40 quarter hours the minimum number of academic credits a student-athlete must earn each year after the first academic year in residence for purposes of fulfilling satisfactory-progress requirements; to amend the "midterm" certification option after the freshman year to require a student-athlete to earn at least 12 hours per term before the beginning of the next fall term or 27 semester or 40 quarter hours during the institution's preceding two semesters or three quarters for a student-athlete to maintain eligibility after the first academic year in residence; and to prorate the missed-term exception to the satisfactory-progress rule at 12 hours per term during the first year of collegiate enrollment and 13 hours per term during subsequent years.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4, page 143, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.5.4 Eligibility Requirements for Competition. Eligibility for competition for a midyear transfer student-athlete, for a student-athlete subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence, or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in any sport at the certifying institution shall be determined by the student-athlete's academic record in existence at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year, based upon:

"(a) Satisfactory completion prior to each fall term of a cumulative total of academic semester or quarter hours equivalent to an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or

"(b) Satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit since the beginning of the previous fall term

"(a) Satisfactory completion of:

"(1) 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit before entering the second academic year in residence at the certifying institution;

"(2) 51 semester or 76 quarter hours of academic credit before entering the third year of enrollment;

"(3) 78 semester or 116 quarter hours of academic credit before entering the fourth year of enrollment, and

"(4) 105 semester or 156 quarter hours of academic credit before entering the fifth year of enrollment; or

"(b) Satisfactory completion of 27 semester or 40 quarter hours during the certifying institution's preceding two semesters or three quarters.

"14.5.4.1 Midyear Transfer Students. A midyear transfer student must satisfactorily complete 12 hours of academic credit per semester or quarter in residence before the beginning of the next fall

term; thereafter, the student must satisfactorily complete 27 semester or 40 quarter hours of academic credit per year prior to each successive fall term.

"14.5.4.2 Nonstandard Hours for Degree. An institution that requires fewer than 120 semester or 180 quarter hours for a baccalaureate degree may replace the requirements specified in 14.5.4-(a) with a prorated requirement that shall not be less than 12 semester or quarter hours of academic credit per semester or quarter."

[14.5.4.1 through 14.5.4.4, renumbered as 14.5.4.3 through 14.5.4.6, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.5.2, page 144, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.5.5.2 Certification at Beginning of Fall Term. A student-athlete's eligibility under either satisfactory-progress option (per 14.5.4) shall be determined on the basis of the student's academic record in existence at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year. If the student-athlete is ineligible under the provisions of the satisfactory-progress legislation at the beginning of the fall term, eligibility may be reinstated at the beginning of any other regular term of that academic year, based upon.

"(a) Satisfactory completion of a cumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit that is equivalent to an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or

"(b) Satisfactory completion of 24 27 or 36 40 quarter hours of academic credit since the beginning of the certifying institution's preceding regular two semesters or three quarters."

[Remainder of 14.5.5.2 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.6, page 146, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.5.6 Exceptions to Satisfactory-Progress Rule

"(a) Missed term—One time during a student-athlete's entire period of collegiate enrollment, the provisions of 14.5.4-(a) may be prorated at 12 hours per term of actual attendance if the student-athlete misses a complete term or consecutive terms during the first academic year of collegiate enrollment and at 13 hours per term if the student-athlete misses a complete term or terms during the second or subsequent academic years of collegiate enrollment. This provision is subject to the following conditions: (1) The student-athlete engaged in no outside competition in the sport during the academic term or terms in which the student was not in attendance, (2) the student was eligible for enrollment during the student's absence and (3) at the time of certification, the student has fulfilled the satisfactory-progress requirements (per 14.5.4) for the terms in which the student was in attendance. A transfer student from a two-year college is not eligible to utilize this one-time excep-

tion during the first academic year of residence at the certifying institution in order to maintain eligibility during the second year in residence. Hours earned while enrolled as a part-time student during the 'missed term' may not be counted in meeting the satisfactory-progress requirement."

[Remainder of 14.5.6 unchanged.]

Source: University of California, Davis; Indiana University, Bloomington; University of Iowa; University of Maryland, College Park; University of Notre Dame; University of Southern California; Stanford University, and University of Washington.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The purpose of this proposal is to improve the progress of student-athletes toward a degree. The proposal increases from 24 to 27 the number of semester units required annually for a student-athlete to maintain eligibility for competition. For institutions on the quarter system, the increase is from 36 to 40 quarter units. This change is equivalent to one additional course per year. Cumulatively, the time to complete a degree is reduced by one semester, making it more likely that student-athletes will graduate prior to leaving the institution. The possibility of banking units is preserved; if more units are earned than required during a given year, they are "carried over" to the total required after the next year. In recognition of the difficulties often attendant upon the transition to college, 24 semester or 36 quarter hours continue to be required during the first year at the certifying institution.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 22 GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACH

Intent: In Division I-A football, to permit an individual to serve as a graduate assistant coach for a third year if the individual successfully completes 24 semester or 36 quarter hours during the initial two-year term.

Bylaws: Amend 11.02.4, page 49, as follows:

[Division I-A football only, roll call]

"11.02.4 Coach, Graduate Assistant. A graduate assistant coach is any coach who has received a baccalaureate degree and is a graduate student enrolled in at least 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular graduate program of studies and qualifies for appointment as a graduate assistant under the policies of the institution. The individual is not required to be enrolled in a specific graduate degree program unless required by institutional policy. The following provisions shall apply:

[11.02.4-(a) and 11.02.4-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) The individual may not serve as a graduate assistant coach for a period of more than two years **except that if the individual successfully completes 24 semester or 36 quarter hours during the initial two-year period, the individual may serve as a graduate assistant coach for a third year.** unless the Council, by a two-thirds majority of

its members present and voting **may** approve a waiver of ~~this~~ **these** two-year limitations based on the fact that the student's service as a coach and enrollment as a graduate student were interrupted for reasons that are unrelated to athletics, or to personal or family finances, and that are beyond the control of the institution or the coach. Such a waiver may not be granted solely to permit the completion of a graduate program;"

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Florida State University; Georgia Institute of Technology; Louisiana State University; University of Oklahoma; University of Pittsburgh; Syracuse University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin; Texas Tech University, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will encourage graduate assistant coaches to complete their graduate degree programs.

Action: Adopted by Division I-A (87-24, two abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 23 EXPENSES—VOLUNTEER COACH—BASEBALL

Intent: In the sport of baseball, to permit the institution to pay expenses for the volunteer coach to travel with the team and to coach at away games.

Bylaws: Amend 11.02.6 by adding new 11.02.6.2, page 50, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.02.6.2 Travel Exception — Baseball. In the sport of baseball, a volunteer coach may receive transportation to and from and room and board at away games and may perform coaching duties at away games."

Source: Grand Canyon University; Louisiana State University; University of Maryland, Eastern Shore; University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Nicholls State University; Southern University, Baton Rouge; Stanford University; University of Texas at Austin, and Wichita State University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The volunteer coach in Division I baseball is restricted to on-campus coaching, which generates undue hardship in the continuity and effectiveness of coaching a baseball team. The majority of travel in baseball is via ground transportation and, therefore, the volunteer coach could travel for minimal expense. The benefits of volunteer coaching positions are essential, but it is difficult for a volunteer coach to gain the confidence of the team, thereby maximizing the utilization of this role, when the volunteer coach is not allowed to perform the various responsibilities of coaching during away games.

Action: Defeated by Division I (84-229, six abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 24 COACHING LIMITATIONS—BASEBALL

Intent: In Division I, to increase the number of full-time baseball coaches from two to three.

Legislative Proposals

A-41

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.4, pages 64-65, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"11.7.4 Division I Sports Other Than Football — Limitations on Number. There shall be a limit on the number of coaches that may be employed by an institution in each sport (other than football) as follows:

	Head or Assistant Coach	Restricted- Earnings Coach
"Sport Baseball.....	23	1"
[Remainder of 11.7.4 unchanged.]		

Source: Grand Canyon University; University of Hawaii; Louisiana State University; University of Maryland, Eastern Shore; Mississippi State University; Nicholls State University; University of Oklahoma; Southern University, Baton Rouge; University of Texas at Austin, Texas A&M University, and Wichita State University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: In the sport of baseball, matters of proper supervision and instruction are of utmost importance. Baseball skills are extremely diverse and specialized by position. The number of players on a team exceed those of many other sports, yet the number of coaches in baseball in many cases is smaller. An increase to a total of four coaches, with three full-time coaches, would enhance a safe learning environment, as well as augment specialized instructional capabilities, thereby increasing the quality of play. Quality recruiting and instruction are essential to the quality of play on the field. The quality of play established in recent years must be maintained. Three full-time coaches can more effectively deal with athletes' concerns, problems and academic counseling, as well as the obvious instruction and recruiting possibilities.

Action: Not moved.

NO. 25 COACHING LIMITATIONS—MEN'S BASKETBALL

Intent: To establish a coaching limitation in Division I men's basketball of one head coach and three assistant coaches instead of one head coach, two assistant coaches and one restricted-earnings coach.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.4, pages 64-65, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"11.7.4 Division I Sports Other Than Football — Limitations on Number. There shall be a limit on the number of coaches that may be employed by an institution in each sport (other than football) as follows:

	Head or Assistant Coach	Restricted- Earnings Coach
"Sport Basketball, Men's.....	34	10"
[Remainder of 11.7.4 unchanged.]		

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Auburn University; Boston College; Duke University; Duquesne University; University of Florida; University of Kentucky; Louisiana State University; University of North Carolina, Charlotte; Northeastern Louisiana University; Northern Arizona University; St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania), and University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The creation of the category of restricted-earnings coach encourages an institution to "bend" rules by obtaining outside employment for such coaches in order to supplement the limited salary that can be provided to a restricted-earnings coach directly by the institution. It is feared that enlisting the financial support of an outside organization or booster will open the door to unwanted outside influence in the basketball program. Additionally, elimination of the restricted-earnings category will provide institutions more flexibility in structuring their coaching staffs and will remove the use of "administrative assistants" to circumvent the intent of coaching staff limitations. Such elimination will not necessarily result in additional expense to the institution, inasmuch as the salary package of the fourth coach would be left entirely to the discretion of the institution. Finally, only three of the institution's four coaches would be permitted to contact or evaluate prospects off campus (two at any one time per Bylaw 11.7.5.1). Thus, this proposal warrants adoption on the basis of integrity (all compensation will be directly "above board" from the institution), institutional control (no outside influence) and increased administrative flexibility.

Action: Defeated by Division I (61-257, five abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 26 COACHING LIMITATIONS—ICE HOCKEY

Intent: To establish a coaching limitation in Division I men's ice hockey of one head coach and two assistant coaches instead of one head coach, one assistant coach and one restricted-earnings coach.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.4, pages 64-65, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"11.7.4 Division I Sports Other Than Football — Limitations on Number. There shall be a limit on the number of coaches that may be employed by an institution in each sport (other than football) as follows:

	Head or Assistant Coach	Restricted- Earnings Coach
"Sport Ice Hockey.....	23	10"
[Remainder of 11.7.4 unchanged.]		

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference; University of Alaska Anchorage; University of Denver; Michigan Technological University; University of North Dakota; Northern Michigan University; University of Minnesota, Duluth, and St. Cloud State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: To guarantee the safety and welfare of student-athletes and to ensure a productive practice and game environment, the sport of ice hockey needs three full-time, experienced coaches. A high-velocity contact sport such as ice hockey should have a player-coach ratio that does not exceed 12:1. This proposal will ensure that athletes are properly coached and supervised during the course of the playing season and the recruiting periods. It also will permit ice hockey to have a number of coaches comparable to other income-producing and contact sports.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 27 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I WOMEN'S EQUIVALENCY SPORTS

Intent: To maintain the grant-in-aid limits that currently are in effect for Division I women's equivalency sports but that are scheduled to be reduced in 1994.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.1, pages 178-179, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.3.1 Division I Maximum Equivalency Limits. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.3.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the following Division I sports:

"Women's Sports:

Cross Country/Track.....	14.4	16	Skiing	63	7
Fencing	45	5	Soccer.....	99	11
Field Hockey.....	9.9	11	Softball	99	11
Golf.....	5.4	6	Swimming	126	14"
Lacrosse	99	11			

[Remainder of 15.5.3.1 unchanged]

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: The NCAA survey on gender equity demonstrates that women historically receive a lower proportion of financial aid compared to men. Restoring the former equivalency limits will assist in correcting this imbalance.

Action: Adopted by Division I (252-50, eight abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 28 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL

Intent: To reinstate the grant-in-aid limitation of 15 in Division I women's basketball.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.4.2, page 181, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.4.2 Women's Basketball — Division I. There shall be an annual limit of 14 during the 1993-94 academic year and 13 during the 1994-95 academic year and thereafter 15 on the total number of counters in the sport of women's basketball at each Division I institution."

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The NCAA survey on gender equity demonstrates that women historically receive a lower proportion of financial aid compared to men. Restoring the former financial aid awards in women's basketball will assist in correcting this imbalance.

Action: Adopted by Division I (221-89, 10 abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 29 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I BASEBALL

Intent: To increase the maximum equivalency limit in the sport of Division I baseball to 13.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.1, page 178, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.3.1 Division I Maximum Equivalency Limits. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.3.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the following Division I sports:

"Men's Sports:

Baseball..... 11.7 13"

[Remainder of 15.5.3.1 unchanged.]

Source: Long Island University-Brooklyn Center; Louisiana State University; University of Maryland, Eastern Shore; University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Nicholls State University; Southern University, Baton Rouge; University of Texas at Austin; Texas A&M University, and Wichita State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Baseball is one of the few sports in which the professional draft routinely selects players at the conclusion of their high-school careers. Some of these quality players decide instead to attend colleges and universities, but reduced scholarships lessen the incentive for these recruits to continue their education. Further, to retain these student-athletes, financial aid incentives must remain intact. Otherwise, intercollegiate baseball carries the unfair burden of competing for student-athletes against the interests of powerful professional baseball. NCAA member institutions must continue to promote the value of a four-year education by preserving the option of a scholarship. Baseball teams play an average of 17 players in a conference series, yet the number of scholarships is 11.7. In comparison to other sports, baseball's squad size is large and total possible scholarships are small. Many programs work and practice with a squad size of 27 to 35. Finally, baseball, in many areas, is a revenue-producing sport.

Action: Not moved.

NO. 30 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL

Intent: To delay the effective date of the reduction from 14 to 13 of the number of scholarships in Division I men's basketball until the 1995-96 academic year.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.4.1, page 181, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.4.1 Men's Basketball — Division I. There shall be an annual limit of 14 during the 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95 academic years and 13 during the 1993-94 1995-96 academic year and thereafter on the total number of counters in the sport of men's basketball at each Division I institution."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Brigham Young University; Cleveland State University; Duke University; Duquesne University; University of Florida; La Salle University; Louisiana State University; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Northeastern Louisiana University; Northern Arizona University; and St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The time frame within which scholarship reductions in men's basketball are scheduled to occur does not allow significant opportunity to study the effect of such a change. Such scholarship reductions may create situations in which programs will have very little margin of error in recruiting prospects. A result of such reductions may be that the incidence of coaches "running off" scholarship student-athletes will increase. The sponsors agree that the reduction from 15 to 14 should go into effect as originally proposed. However, the effective date for the implementation of the reduction from 14 to 13 scholarships (currently effective for the 1993-94 academic year) should be postponed two years (until the 1995-96 academic year) to permit the further study of the effect of the reduction to 14 scholarships.

Action: Defeated by Division I (134-178, 10 abstentions); motion to reconsider defeated (152-169, five abstentions), roll-call votes.

NO. 31 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATIONS—MEN'S ICE HOCKEY

Intent: In Division I ice hockey, to specify that a recruited student-athlete who receives institutional financial aid granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability does not have to be included in the maximum institutional financial aid limitations until the student-athlete engages in varsity intercollegiate competition, provided the institution certifies the nonathletics basis of the student-athlete's admission and institutional financial aid; to specify that there shall be an annual limit of 20 on the value of financial aid awards (equivalencies); to specify that there shall be an annual limit of 30 on the total number of counters, and to specify that a multiple-sport participant who practices or competes in ice hockey and one or more other sports (other than football or basketball) shall be counted in men's ice hockey.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5, pages 175-184, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5 MAXIMUM INSTITUTIONAL GRANT-IN-AID LIMITATIONS BY SPORT

"15.5.1 Counters. A student-athlete shall be a counter and included in the maximum awards limitations set forth in this bylaw under the following conditions.

[15.5.1.1 unchanged.]

"15.5.1.2 Recruited Student-Athlete

"15.5.1.2.1 Division I Football or, Basketball or Ice Hockey, Varsity Competition. In Division I football or, basketball or ice hockey, a student-athlete who was recruited by the awarding institution and who receives institutional financial aid (as set forth in 15.02.3.1) granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability does not have to be counted until the student-athlete engages in varsity intercollegiate competition (as opposed to freshman, B-team, subvarsity, intramural or club competition) in either of those sports. For this provision to be applicable, there shall be on file in the office of the athletics director certification by the faculty athletics representative, the admissions officer and the chair of the financial aid committee that the student's admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability.

"15.5.1.2.2 Division I Football or, Basketball or Ice Hockey — Partial Qualifier. In Division I football or, basketball or ice hockey, a student-athlete who is a partial qualifier (as set forth in 14.02.9.2) and who was recruited by the awarding institution and who receives institutional financial aid that is not from athletics sources and that is based on financial need only (as set forth in 14.3.2.1.1) shall be a counter and included in the maximum awards limitations set forth in this bylaw when the student-athlete participates in an institutional practice session or represents the institution against outside competition.

"15.5.1.2.3 Sports Other Than Football and, Basketball and Ice Hockey. In all sports other than football and, basketball and ice hockey in Division I and in all sports in Division II, a student-athlete who was recruited by the awarding institution and who is receiving institutional financial aid (as set forth in 15.02.3.1) shall be a counter unless there is on file in the office of the athletics director certification by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability.

[Remainder of 15.5.1 and 15.5.2 unchanged.]

"15.5.3 Equivalency Sports

"15.5.3.1 Division I Maximum Equivalency Limits. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.3.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the following Division I sports:

"Men's Sports:

Ice Hockey 18 20

[Remainder of 15.5.3, 15.5.4 and 15.5.5 unchanged.]

"15.5.6 Ice Hockey Limitations

"15.5.6.1 Division I Ice Hockey. There shall be an

annual limit of 20 on the value of financial aid awards (equivalencies) to counters and an annual limit of 30 on the total number of counters in the sport of ice hockey at each Division I ice hockey institution.

"15.5.6 15.5.7 Multiple-Sport Participants

[15.5.6.1 and 15.5.6.2, renumbered as 15.5.7.1 and 15.5.7.2, unchanged.]

"15.5.7.3 Ice Hockey. A counter who practices or competes in men's ice hockey and one or more other sports (other than football or basketball) shall be counted in men's ice hockey."

[15.5.6.3 through 15.5.6.7, renumbered as 15.5.7.4 through 15.5.7.8, and 15.5.7 through 15.5.9, renumbered as 15.5.8 through 15.5.10, unchanged.]

Source: University of Alaska Anchorage; University of Denver; Michigan Technological University; University of Minnesota; Duluth; University of North Dakota; Northern Michigan University; St. Cloud State University, and University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: In the mid-1980s, ice hockey voluntarily reduced the maximum number of financial aid awards from 23 to 20. Ice hockey actually plays 20 participants (18 skaters and two goal-tenders) on a relative equal basis during each game. To protect private universities and the parity of the existing Division I competition, 20 financial aid awards are necessary. To maintain reasonable limits, such as football and basketball, only 30 counters may be in existence at one time. It also is the intent of the proposal to place ice hockey in the same category as football and basketball regarding multiple-sport participants. It is necessary that financial aid limits are kept reasonable by counting against ice hockey anyone who is receiving aid and plays that sport, regardless of their involvement in other sports.

Action: Adopted by Division I as amended by 31-1 (216-14, 90 abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 31-1 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATIONS — MEN'S ICE HOCKEY

Intent: To eliminate the proposed increase in the annual limit on the value of financial aid awards (equivalencies) in men's ice hockey.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 31, 15.5.3 through 15.5.6, as follows.
[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.3 Equivalency Sports

"15.5.3.1 Division I Maximum Equivalency Limits. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.3.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the following Division I sports:

"Men's Sports:

"Ice Hockey20 18

[Remainder of 15.5.3, 15.5.4 and 15.5.5 unchanged.]

"15.5.6 Ice Hockey Limitations

"15.5.6.1 Division I Ice Hockey. There shall be an annual limit of 20 18 on the value of financial aid awards (equivalencies) to counters and an annual limit of 30 on the total number of counters in the sport of ice hockey at each Division I ice hockey institution."

Source: All members of the North Atlantic Conference; Brown University; Clarkson University; Colgate University; Cornell University; Dartmouth College; Harvard University; University of Massachusetts, Lowell; Merrimack College; Princeton University; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institution; St. Lawrence University; Union College (New York), and Yale University.

Rationale: The sponsors wish to maintain the current equivalency limit in Division I ice hockey in the spirit of cost containment, while retaining the proposed overall limit on the number of counters.

Action: Adopted by Division I (206-30, 80 abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 32 SPRING FOOTBALL PRACTICE—DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA

Intent: To eliminate contact restrictions during spring football practice in Divisions I-A and I-AA.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.6, page 246, as follows.

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football is prohibited, except for the following:

"(a) Spring Practice — Division I. In Division I, 15 postseason practice sessions are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 29 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar and days during which the institution is closed due to inclement weather, with no practices permitted on Sundays. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 10 of the 15 sessions may involve contact. The amount of time that a student-athlete may be involved in such postseason practice activities shall be limited to a maximum of 20 hours per week;"

[Remainder of 17.7.6 unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Brigham Young University; East Carolina University; Florida State University; Georgia Institute of Technology; Memphis State University; University of Oklahoma; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Spring football practice is the most important time to teach technique, experiment with position changes, evaluate personnel, and install new offensive and defensive systems.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-49

With practice limited to 15 days in which to teach and learn correct blocking and tackling techniques, the use of contact should be left to the discretion of the institution's coaching staff to allow for the development of the team.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 33 COUNTABLE ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES—DIVISION I BASEBALL

Intent: In Division I baseball, to permit student-athletes to participate in countable athletically related activities for 24 hours per week during the nontraditional segment.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.1 by adding new 17.1.5.1.1, page 209, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"17.1.5.1.1 Baseball Exception — Nontraditional Segment. In the sport of Division I baseball during the nontraditional segment, a student-athlete's participation in countable athletically related activities (see 17.02.1.1) may exceed the four-hour-per-day limitation but shall be limited to a maximum of 24 hours per week during the nontraditional segment."

Source: Grand Canyon University; Louisiana State University; University of Maryland, Eastern Shore; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Nicholls State University; Southern University, Baton Rouge; University of Texas at Austin, and Wichita State University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current limit on practice time (which occurs primarily during the fall and early spring) does not provide coaches adequate time for evaluation and instruction given the variety of skills required by the game of baseball. Restricted evaluation time in the fall prohibits walk-on candidates from being observed and taught adequately. Because of the necessary instruction for the tremendous number of skills necessary to play baseball, more time is needed in the nontraditional season, when much of this instruction takes place.

Action: Not moved.

NO. 34 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—DIVISION I BASEBALL

Intent: In Division I baseball, to increase an institution's declared playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) from 22 to 24 weeks.

Bylaws: Amend 17.2.1, page 216, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"17.2.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) in baseball shall be limited to the following:

"(a) Division I — A maximum of 24 weeks.

"(a) (b) Divisions I and II — A maximum of 22 weeks."

[17.2.1-(b), relettered as 17.2.1-(c), unchanged.]

Source: Grand Canyon University; Louisiana State University; University of Maryland, Eastern Shore; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Nicholls State University; Southern University, Baton Rouge; University of Texas at Austin; Texas A&M University, and Wichita State University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current limit of 22 weeks in baseball is incongruous with the intent of NCAA legislation to establish a level playing field (Constitution 2.6 — the principle of competitive equity). Baseball is absolutely subject to weather conditions. Because weather cannot be legislated, this 22-week restriction decreases the opportunities for northern colleges by denying them the opportunity to maximize outdoor workouts and evaluations. Further, such a limit discourages potential student-athletes, and professional baseball becomes all the more appealing. The 24-week proposal is consistent with individual-sport limits. The majority of baseball skills are individual. Pitchers compose one-third to one-half of a baseball squad. Because pitchers need a three- or four-day rest between outings, a 24-week allowance will provide them with the necessary practice time.

Action: Defeated by Division I (42-272, nine abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 35 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS—DIVISION I BASKETBALL

Intent. To permit Division I institutions to exempt annually contests in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, the preseason National Invitation Tournament, and the Tip-Off Classic Tournament from the maximum number of basketball contests, provided participation is limited to no more than one such event per year and provided further that participation in the same event does not occur more than once every four years.

Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.3.2, page 227, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"17.3.5.3.2 Additional Division I Options. Not more than once every four years a year, a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests provided, however, that the same event may not be exempted more than once in any four-year period:

"(a) Hawaii or Alaska Contests. Not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Alaska or Hawaii) or one tournament (not to exceed three contests), by a member institution located outside the area in question, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member located in Alaska or Hawaii;

"(b) Puerto Rico Contests. Not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Puerto Rico) or one tournament (not to exceed four con-

tests), by a member institution located outside of Puerto Rico, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member located in Puerto Rico;

"(c) Preseason National Invitation Tournament. The games played in the preseason National Invitation Tournament, or

"(d) Tip-Off Classic. The Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game."

Source: DePaul University; Fairleigh Dickinson University; Teaneck; Fordham University; George Mason University; University of Hartford; University of Hawaii; Manhattan College; Marist College; St. John's University (New York); St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania); Seton Hall University; Southwest Missouri State University, and Wagner College.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Under the current Bylaw 17.3.5.3.2, Division I institutions may participate in only one of the listed events in any four-year period. This limitation has forced these events to become competitive with each other for participants and to sign teams as much as three years in advance. The result has been to turn what was intended to be a once-in-a-four-year limitation into, effectively, a once-in-seven-year limitation. For example, a team signed in 1992 for participation in 1995 becomes ineligible to participate in any event for the three years prior to its year of actual participation, and then it again becomes ineligible for another four years after its year of participation. That team, therefore, would be limited to one participation between 1992 and 1999. Such an extreme limitation clearly was not the intention of the current 17.3.5.3.2. The proposed amendment represents a middle ground between the original legislation, which permitted annual exemptions in many of the listed events and the current 17.3.5.3.2.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 36 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS— DIVISIONS I AND II ICE HOCKEY

Intent: In Divisions I and II ice hockey, to revise the legislation related to the length of the playing season, preseason practice, first contest date and the end of the regular playing season.

Bylaws: Amend 17.10.1 through 17.10.4, page 257, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"17.10.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) in ice hockey shall be limited to the following:

"(a) Divisions I and II — *A maximum of 22 weeks* **The period of time between the start of preseason practice per 17.10.2 and the end of the regular playing season per 17.10.4.**

[17.10.1-(b) unchanged.]

"17.10.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions *in each segment* in ice hockey prior to the following dates:

"17.10.2.1 Divisions I and II. The first Monday in October.

"17.10.2.2 Traditional Segment

[17.10.2.1-(a) deleted.]

"(b) Division III — August 24 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first.

"17.10.2.3 Nontraditional Segment

[17.10.2.2-(a) deleted.]

"(b) Division III — September 1 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first.

"17.10.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in ice hockey prior to the following dates, except as provided under 17.10.3.1:

"(a) Divisions I and II — *The second Friday in October* **19th calendar day of the on-ice practice period.**

"(b) Divisions II and III — October 15.

[17.10.3.1 unchanged.]

"17.10.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) *in each segment* in the sport of ice hockey by the following dates:

"17.10.4.1 Divisions I and II — The conclusion of the National Collegiate Division I Men's Ice Hockey Championship game.

"17.10.4.2 Division III:

"(a) Traditional Segment — The conclusion of the National Collegiate Division I Men's Ice Hockey Championship game, and

"(b) Nontraditional Segment — The last date of final exams for the regular academic year at the institution."

Source: University of Alaska Anchorage; University of Denver; Michigan Technological University; University of North Dakota; Northern Michigan University; University of Minnesota, Duluth; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; St. Cloud State University, and University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: In the sport of men's ice hockey, existing legislation has contributed to situations that left some teams with as few as five preseason practice days. It is the purpose of this proposal to guarantee a proper 18-day preseason training schedule, to eliminate the nonapplicable nontraditional segment and to have each Division I and II hockey institution play its allotted number of games between the third weekend of October and the start of the NCAA tournament. The timeframe for playing games actually is shortened by one calendar week.

Action: Withdrawn in Division I; not moved in Division II.

NO. 36-1 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — DIVISIONS I AND II ICE HOCKEY

Intent: To limit the length of the playing and practice season in Divisions I and II ice hockey to 22 weeks.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 36, 17.10.1, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"17.10.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) in ice hockey shall be limited to the following:

"(a) Divisions I and II — **A maximum of 22 weeks within** the period of time between the start of preseason practice per 17.10.2 and the end of the regular playing season per 17.10.4."

[Remainder of 17.10.1 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the North Atlantic Conference, Brown University, Clarkson University, Colgate University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, Princeton University, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, St. Lawrence University, Union College (New York) and Yale University.

Rationale: This proposal endorses the current 22-week limit on the length of the playing and practice season in ice hockey, consistent with all other team sports in Divisions I and II.

Action: Not moved in Divisions I and II.

NO. 37 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—SKILL INSTRUCTION—DIVISION II

Intent: To permit athletics department staff members in Division II to direct or supervise individual workout sessions with student-athletes during the academic year outside of the team's designated playing and practice season, provided the sessions do not exceed two hours per week, do not involve more than two student-athletes and are counted against the eight-hour weekly maximum.

Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1, pages 203-205, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"17.02.1 Athletically Related Activities

"17.02.1.1 Countable Athletically Related Activities. The following are considered countable athletically related activities and must be counted in the weekly or daily time limitations specified under 17.1.5.1 for Divisions I and II:

[17.02.1.1-(a) through 17.02.1.1-(g) unchanged.]

"(h) Individual workouts required or supervised by a member of the coaching staff except as set forth in 17.02.1.2.1, 17.02.1.2.2 or 17.02.1.2.3 or 17.02.1.2.4;

[Remainder of 17.02.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.02.1.2 Noncountable Athletically Related Activities. The following are considered noncountable athletically related activities and are not counted in the weekly or daily time limitations specified under 17.1.5.1 for Divisions I and II:

[17.02.1.2-(a) through 17.02.1.2-(o), 17.02.1.2.1 and 17.02.1.2.2 unchanged.]

"17.02.1.2.3 Academic-Year Workout Sessions. In all Division II sports other than football, a coach may direct or supervise individual workout sessions with student-athletes from a team during the academic year and outside of the team's designated playing and practice season, provided the workout sessions do not involve more than two student-athletes from a team, do not exceed two hours per week and are counted against the eight-hour weekly maximum specified in 17.1.5.2."

[17.02.1.2.3, renumbered as 17.02.1.2.4, unchanged.]

Source: Augustana College (South Dakota); Kentucky State University; Mankato State University; University of Nebraska at Kearney; North Dakota State University; Northern Kentucky University; Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science, and Southwest Baptist University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Restricted, off-season, skill-related workouts held at the direction of or supervised by an institutional staff member will heighten personal athletics potential and permit flexibility to allow coaches to meet institutional obligations. The academic and personal welfare of student-athletes will not be altered as the spirit and intent of preserving their needs remains intact. Division II coaches generally have fewer opportunities to tailor individualized academic and athletics experiences for student-athletes. Besides athletics responsibilities, Division II coaches often have additional academic duties during the season such as teaching, advising, campus recreation and institutional commitments. These responsibilities often preclude Division II coaches from committing time during the permissive in-season, four-hour-per-day limitation to student-athletes on an individual basis. Thus, priority is not given to personalized skill enhancement. Further, many Division II athletics programs rely heavily on part-time employees to serve as head and assistant coaches, once again limiting opportunities for student-athletes to receive individualized assistance.

Action: Not moved.

NO. 38 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Intent: In Division III, to establish a uniform playing season in all sports and establish one continuous traditional season in the sports of cross country and indoor and outdoor track and field, respectively, in which all practice and competition must occur. [Note: This proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, pages 216-311, for each sport (other than cross country, football, and indoor and outdoor track and field) by amending the respective section entitled "Length of Playing Season," as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.____.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) shall be limited to the following:

"(b) Division III — A maximum of 21 weeks, except in the sports of cross country, football, and indoor and outdoor track and field. In these sports, the playing season shall be conducted between the first permissible practice date and the end of the institution's playing season."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, pages 216-311, for each sport (other than football) by amending the respective section entitled "Preseason Practice," as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.____.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in each segment prior to the following dates:

"(a) Fall Sports Other Than Football (cross country, field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball). In all fall sports other than football, the date that permits a maximum of 21 practice opportunities (see 17.02.13) prior to the first scheduled intercollegiate contest.

"(b) Winter Sports.

"(1) Ice Hockey, Swimming and Wrestling — 19 weeks prior to the first round of the NCAA Division III championship in that sport.

"(2) Basketball — Off-court practice may not occur prior to 19 weeks before the date of the first round of the NCAA Division III Basketball Championship. On-court practice may not occur prior to November 1.

"(3) Indoor Track and Field — November 1.

"(c) Spring Sports (baseball, men's golf, lacrosse, softball, tennis, and outdoor track and field):

"(1) Traditional Segment — February 1.

"(2) Nontraditional Segment — First day of classes, except that in outdoor track and field, a member institution shall not conduct a nontraditional segment."

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, pages 216-311, for each sport (other than football) by amending the respective section entitled "First Contest Date/First Date of Competition," as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.____.3 First Contest Date. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in each segment prior to the following dates:

"(a) Fall Sports Other Than Football.

"(1) Cross Country, Soccer, Field Hockey and Women's Volleyball — 10 weeks prior to the first

round of the NCAA championship in that sport.

"(2) Exhibition Scrimmage. In cross country, soccer, field hockey and women's volleyball, a member institution may utilize one date for an unlimited number of exhibition scrimmage(s) during the permissible preseason practice period, which counts as one contest or date of competition in the institution's maximum number of contests or dates of competition in that sport.

"(b) Winter Sports Other Than Basketball (ice hockey, swimming, indoor track and field, and wrestling) — November 1.

"(c) Spring Sports (baseball, men's golf, lacrosse, softball, tennis, and outdoor track and field).

"(1) Traditional Segment — February 1.

"(2) Nontraditional Segment — First day of classes, except that in outdoor track and field, a member institution shall not conduct a nontraditional segment."

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, pages 216-311, for each sport by amending the respective section entitled "End of Regular Playing Season," as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.____.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) in each segment by the following dates:

"(a) Fall Sports

"(1) Traditional Segment — The last regular-season contest (which shall be conducted not later than the NCAA championship in the sport) or postseason competition when selected for that competition.

"(2) Nontraditional Segment — The last date of examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.

"(b) Winter Sports — The last regular-season contest (which shall be conducted not later than the NCAA championship in that sport) or postseason competition when selected for that competition.

"(c) Spring Sports. The last regular-season contest (which shall be conducted not later than the NCAA championship in that sport) or postseason competition when selected for that championship."

E. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.6 by adding new 17.1.6.2, page 210, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.1.6.2 Nontraditional Segment Limitation. In sports in which a nontraditional segment is permissible, countable athletically related activities shall be limited to four days per week."

[17.1.6.2, renumbered as 17.1.6.3, unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The establishment of uniform dates for starting and concluding the playing seasons will enhance competitive equity.

Action: Defeated by Division III (22-215, two abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 39 DIVISION III PRESEASON PRACTICE OPPORTUNITIES—TRADITIONAL SEGMENT

Intent: To permit Division III institutions 21 preseason practice opportunities prior to an institution's first contest or date of competition in the traditional segment in all sports other than football. [Note: The following proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.21, pages 216-311, for each sport except football by amending the respective sections entitled "Preseason Practice," as follows.

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.2.1 Traditional Segment

"(b) Division III — August 24 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first. **The date that permits a maximum of 21 practice opportunities (see 17.02.13) prior to the first scheduled intercollegiate contest or date of competition in the traditional segment, regardless of when the traditional segment occurs.**"

Source: All members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: It makes more sense to utilize preseason opportunities during the traditional playing season rather than using specified starting dates. It will provide all sports an equal opportunity to prepare for the traditional season and enable Division III institutions to maintain a consistent preseason practice period, rather than facing problems created by varying academic calendars.

Action: Defeated by Division III (43-201, three abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 40 ON-COURT BASKETBALL PRACTICE—DIVISIONS II AND III

Intent: To specify that Divisions II and III institutions may commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions October 15.

Bylaws: Amend 17.3.2.1, page 221, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions II and III, divided vote, roll call]

"17.3.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to

November 1 in Division I and October 15 in Divisions II and III.

[17.3.2.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.3.2.1.2 Prohibited Activities. Prior to November 1 in Division I and October 15 in Divisions II and III, members of the institution's coaching staff may not be involved with one or more team members at any location in any of the following activities:

[17.3.2.1.2-(a) through 17.3.2.1.2-(f) unchanged.]

"17.3.2.1.2.1 Exception. Team promotional activities (e.g., autograph sessions, fan picture sessions, meeting with fans) per 12.5.1 are permissible prior to November 1 in Division I and October 15 in Divisions II and III, provided these promotional arrangements do not involve any of the practice activities prohibited under the provisions of 17.3.2.1.2."

Source: Alfred University; American University of Puerto Rico; Augustana College (South Dakota); Grand Canyon University; Kentucky State University; Lincoln University (Pennsylvania); Mankato State University; Marymount University; Mississippi College; University of Nebraska at Kearney; Nebraska Wesleyan University; North Dakota State University; Northern Kentucky University; Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science; University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown; Regis University (Colorado); South Dakota State University; Southwest Baptist University, and Stillman University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Moving the starting date back for on-court basketball practice to November 1 in Divisions II and III, without a corresponding adjustment to the starting date for competition, is counter-productive to the needs of student-athletes. This shortened period of time forces coaches to maximize the practice, which potentially places more physical and personal demands on student-athletes. By compressing the on-court practice season, the academic welfare, health and safety of student-athletes are placed in jeopardy.

Action: Defeated by Division II (98-115) and Division III (49-214, three abstentions), roll-call votes.

NO. 41 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT

Intent: To limit Division III nontraditional segments to 26 days and to prohibit countable athletically related activities during at least one day per week during that segment.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.2, pages 208-209, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.1.2 Segments of Playing Season. For all team sports and for all individual sports that do not utilize the 144-day traditional season option, each member institution may divide the playing season into not more than two distinct segments, as follows:

[17.1.2-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Nontraditional Segment. The remaining portion of the playing season shall be known as the 'nontraditional segment.' In Division III, sports conducting nontraditional segments shall be limited to 26 days on which practice and competition may occur."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.6.1, page 210, as follows:
[Division III only, roll call]

"17.1.6.1 Football and Basketball and **Both Traditional and Nontraditional** Segments in All Other Sports. All countable athletically related activities shall be prohibited during one calendar day per week in the sports of football and basketball and during **both** the traditional and nontraditional segments in all other sports."

Source: All members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Placing limitations on nontraditional segments appears to be both a desirable objective and consistent with the principle of reducing time demands on student-athletes. Establishing a limit of 26 dates for practice and competition in sports that conduct nontraditional seasons and mandating one day off per week when there can be no countable athletically related activities would achieve such an objective. Institutions, however, should have flexibility in determining the days during the nontraditional season on which practice or competition will occur. The one day off per week when classes are in session would make the nontraditional season consistent with the legislation governing the traditional season.

Action: Defeated by Division III (64-197, five abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 42 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS— DIVISION III WOMEN'S GOLF

Intent: To specify that a Division III institution's women's golf program shall have the same limitations on length of playing season, preseason practice, first date of competition and numbers of dates of competition as men's golf programs in Division III.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.4, page 209, as follows:
[Division III only, roll call]

"17.1.4 Sports Subject to Segment Limitations. Playing-season segment limitations are applicable to all team sports that are listed in 17.02.15.1 and all individual sports listed under 17.02.15.2. In those sports for which the National Collegiate Championship is the only NCAA championships opportunity, **excluding women's golf** (i.e., men's and women's fencing, *women's golf*, men's and women's gymnastics, men's and women's rifle, men's and women's skiing, men's volleyball, water polo), a Division III institution's playing season shall be limited to the same length as Division I institutions, and this limitation shall be implied in all subsequent legislative references affecting the Division III sport."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.8, pages 248-254, as follows:
[Division III only, roll call]

"17.8 GOLF

"Regulations for computing the golf playing season are set forth in 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations.

"17.8.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) in golf shall be limited to the following:

[17.8.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III:

"(1) **Men and Women** — A maximum of 21 weeks.

"(2) *Women* — An institution must select one of the following:

"(a) *24-Week Option.* A maximum of 24 weeks

"(b) *144-Day Traditional-Season Option.* A 144-day traditional season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only the time between these segments, required off days per 17.1.5.4 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur

"(c) *144-Day Traditional/Nontraditional Segment Option.* A 144-consecutive-day season, which shall be divided into a traditional and nontraditional segment and which may exclude only required off days per 17.1.5.4 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur.

"17.8.2 Preseason Practice and First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in golf or engage in its first date of competition (meet or practice meet) with outside competition in each segment in golf prior to the following dates:

"17.8.2.1 Preseason Practice

"17.8.2.1.1 Traditional Segment

[17.8.2.1.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III:

"(1) **Men and Women** — August 24 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first.

"(2) *Women* The date that permits a maximum of 21 permissible practice opportunities (see 17.02.13) prior to the first scheduled intercollegiate contest.

"17.8.2.1.2 Nontraditional Segment

[17.8.2.1.2-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III:

"(1) **Men and Women** — September 1 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first.

"(2) *Women* — September 7.

"17.8.2.2 First Date of Competition

"17.8.2.2.1 Traditional Segment

[17.8.2.2.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III:

"(1) **Men and Women** — August 24 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first.

"(2) **Women** — September 7.

"17.8.2.2.2 Nontraditional Segment

[17.8.2.2.2-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III:

"(1) **Men and Women** — September 1 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first.

"(2) **Women** — September 7.

[17.8.3 unchanged.]

"17.8.4 Number of Dates of Competition

"17.8.4.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of golf during the permissible golf playing season to the following number of dates of competition, except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.8.4.2:

[17.8.4.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) **Division III Women** — 24.

"(c) **(b) Division III (Men) and Women** — 20.

[17.8.4.1.1 through 17.8.4.1.3 unchanged.]

"17.8.4.1.4 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in the following number of dates of competition in golf (this limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

[17.8.4.1.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) **Division III (Women)** — 24.

"(c) **(b) Division III (Men) and Women** — 20."

[Remainder of 17.8 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee) and all members of the Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: There are 32 Division III institutions that sponsor women's golf. Twenty-three of those institutions are in Michigan, Minnesota and Iowa and hold their respective conference championships in the fall. Weather restricts the season in those states to about mid-October as the latest date for participation in the fall. This proposal would add six additional days to the women's golf nontraditional season in the fall.

Action: Adopted by Division III (228-19, 16 abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 43 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—DIVIDING SEGMENTS

Intent: To specify that a Division III institution may conduct a non-traditional segment in the fall in which practice and competition do not begin until after October 15 and are completed by December 1.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1 10.3, page 216, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.1 10.3 Dividing Traditional and Nontraditional Segments — Division III. A member institution that divides its practice and playing season into two distinct segments per 17.1.2 and conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall must complete all practice and competition by October 30 of the academic year involved **or, if it does not begin practice or competition until after October 15, it must complete all practice and competition by December 1**; conversely, a member institution that conducts its traditional segment in the fall may not begin practice or competition during its nontraditional segment until February 1 of the academic year involved."

Source: All members of the Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The present rule does not allow for flexibility in Division III institutions whose coaches serve in dual capacities (e.g., head baseball coaches who also coach football). Since the football season finishes after October 30, the rule eliminates any opportunity for a nontraditional season. This rule will not change the rationale or intent of the legislation reducing demands on athletics program resources and on the student-athletes themselves.

Action: Defeated by Division III (104-156, three abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 44 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS—BASEBALL

Intent: To exempt competition in one season-ending baseball tournament (e.g., NCAA, NAIA, ECAC) from the contest limitations in the sport of baseball.

Bylaws: Amend 17.2.5.3, pages 217-218, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and III, divided vote, roll call]

"17.2.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of baseball contests shall exclude the following:

[17.2 5.3-(a) and 17.2.5.3-(b) unchanged; 17.2.5.3-(c) deleted.]

"(d) **(c) NCAA Championship Season-Ending Tournament.** Competition in an NCAA baseball championship **one season-ending baseball tournament** (e.g., NCAA, NAIA, ECAC). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season;"

[17.2.5.3-(e) through 17.2.5.3-(m), relettered as 17.2.5.3-(d) through 17.2.5.3-(l), unchanged.]

Source: Babson College, Brandeis University, Eastern Connecticut State University, Frostburg State University, Ithaca College, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Franklin & Marshall College and Smith College.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: This proposal will reward outstanding performance by allowing participation in one season-ending baseball tournament (in addition to the conference championship or conference play-off currently exempted) from the maximum number of games in the sport of baseball. Presently the only postseason opportunity for a team is to qualify for the NCAA tournament. This exemption would allow one season-ending competition after the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of the regular season.

Action: Not moved in Division I; defeated in Division III (46-206, six abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 45 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS—DIVISION III BASKETBALL

Intent: To permit a Division III institution to exempt annually from its maximum number of basketball contests a home exhibition contest against a foreign team.

Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.2, pages 226-227, as follows:
[Division III only, roll call]

"17.3.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests each year shall exclude the following:

[17.3.5.2-(a) through 17.3.5.2-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Foreign Team in U.S. For Divisions I and III only, a home exhibition contest against a foreign team in the U.S.;"

[Remainder of 17.3.5.2 unchanged.]

Source: California Lutheran University; Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges; University of Dubuque; Franklin and Marshall College; Hamilton College; University of La Verne; Muskingum College; North Adams State College; Occidental College; Plymouth State College; University of Redlands; Salem State College; Whittier College, and University of Wisconsin, Whitewater.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: During the 1991 Convention, the exemption for games against a foreign team in the United States was removed from the legislation. During the 1992 Convention, Division I voted to restore this annual exemption, among others. In Division III, this game requires no travel or additional costs, nor does it result in lost class time. This game normally is played prior to the start of the regular season and is considered an exhibition or practice game. It does not count in NCAA statistics or the institution's official won-lost record and results in a very positive cultural experience.

Action: Adopted by Division III (137-121, two abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 46 DIVISION III PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Intent: To establish the first Saturday in September as the first permissible contest date for fall traditional segments in the sports of cross country, field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.4.3.1, page 230, as follows:
[Division III only, roll call]

"17.4.3.1 Traditional Segment

[17.4.3.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — August 24 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first **The first Saturday in September.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.6.3.1, page 237, as follows:
[Division III only, roll call]

"17.6.3.1 Traditional Segment

[17.6.3.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — August 24 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first **The first Saturday in September.**"

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.14.3.1, page 272, as follows:
[Division III only, roll call]

"17.14.3.1 Traditional Segment

[17.14.3.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — August 24 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first **The first Saturday in September.**"

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.19.3.1, page 298, as follows:
[Division III only, roll call]

"17.19.3.1 Traditional Segment

[17.19.3.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday **The first Saturday in September.**"

Source: All members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: This proposal will make the fall starting dates for competition consistent for these sports and will establish separate starting dates for practice and competition in Division III.

Action: Defeated by Division III (44-214, four abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 47 MAXIMUM DATES OF COMPETITION—DIVISION III CROSS COUNTRY

Intent: To increase from eight to nine the maximum number of

dates of competition in Division III cross country.

Bylaws: Amend 17.4.5, pages 230-231, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.4.5 Number of Dates of Competition

"17.4.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of cross country during the institution's cross country playing season to the following number of dates of competition (games or scrimmages), except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.4.5.3:

[17.4.5.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — § 9.

[17.4.5.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.4.5.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in the following number of cross country dates of competition (this limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

[17.4.5.2-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Division III — § 9."

[Remainder of 17.4.5 unchanged.]

Source: California Lutheran University; Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges; University of Dubuque; Franklin and Marshall College; Hamilton College; University of La Verne; North Adams State College; Occidental College; University of Redlands; Salem State College; Whittier College, and University of Wisconsin, Whitewater.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The 1991 Convention reduced the maximum number of Division III cross country dates of competition from nine to eight. This was an arbitrary cut within the entire reform package and is not consistent with the length of the fall cross country season or equitable with the number of contest dates in other fall sports. In Division III, there is not a significant cost factor involved or any missed class time in restoring this original maximum. This would give competitors in cross country a more legitimate competitive season in relation to the practice season.

Action: Adopted by Division III (157-102, four abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 48 MAXIMUM NUMBER OF CONTESTS—DIVISION III FOOTBALL

Intent: In Division III, to exempt participation in three junior varsity or freshman football contests from a student-athlete's maximum contest limits.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.5.1.2, page 244, as follows:
[Division III football only, roll call]

"17.7.5.1.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 11 football contests in Divisions I and II and in not more than 10 football games in Division III. This limitation includes those contests in which the student-athlete represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution. **In Division III, participation by a student-athlete in a maximum of three junior varsity or freshman football contests shall be excluded from this limitation."**

Source: All members of the Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: This legislation will provide an opportunity for football student-athletes, including those who participate on a limited basis in varsity contests, to also participate in three junior varsity or freshman football contests. Too often junior varsity or freshman football student-athletes have the opportunity to play in a varsity contest only on special teams or late in a contest when the final outcome of the game has been determined. The Division III philosophy emphasizes participation. This proposal will maximize opportunities for the participation of Division III football student-athletes.

Action: Defeated by Division III (40-125), roll-call vote.

NO. 49 PRESEASON FOOTBALL SCRIMMAGE—DIVISION III

Intent: To permit Division III institutions annually to exempt from the maximum contest limitations one informal, preseason practice scrimmage in the sport of football.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.5.2, pages 244-246, as follows:
[Division III football only, roll call]

"17.7.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of football contests shall exclude the following:

[17.7.5.2-(a) and 17.7.5.2-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Division III Scrimmage. For Division III only, one informal, preseason football scrimmage with outside competition conducted in privacy without publicity or official scoring;"

[17.7.5.2-(c) through 17.7.5.2-(m), relettered as 17.7.5.2-(d) through 17.7.5.2-(n), unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic and Ohio Athletic Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Two years ago, as part of a reform movement swirling through Division I, Division III cut its football playing season and eliminated the one scrimmage that was allowed previously. Football was not targeted, nor was it ever a national problem in Division III. We "coat-tailed" on the Division I reform move-

ment. There is data to show that student-athletes achieve higher grades when they are in season. Football student-athletes miss less class time than most, if not all, of their counterparts. Games are almost always played on Saturdays, practices are only after classes and travel is largely day of the game. The scrimmage would be local and would have a minimal budgetary impact. The scrimmage is crucial to allow student-athletes and game officials to become better prepared physically for the season ahead. This is a contact sport and game-type experience is crucial. We are allowing two such scrimmages in basketball for the same reasons. The current language permitting 10 contests (all games or nine games and one scrimmage) does not really encourage anyone to scrimmage, to the contrary, it makes it almost impossible to do so because no one wants to give up a game.

Action: Defeated by Division III (62-106), roll-call vote.

*** NO. 50 JOINT POLICY BOARD**

Intent: To establish an NCAA Joint Policy Board, comprised of the Administrative Committee and the officers of the Presidents Commission, to review and concur in the Association's budget, legislative process and agenda, evaluation and supervision of the executive director, and other nonlegislative policies as may be identified by the Council or the Presidents Commission.

Constitution: Amend Constitution 4 by adding new 4.6, page 24, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"4.6 JOINT POLICY BOARD

"4.6.1 Composition. The Joint Policy Board shall consist of the officers of the Association (see 4.4.1), the executive director and the officers of the Presidents Commission (see 4.5.5.1 and 4.5.5.2).

"4.6.2 Duties and Responsibilities. The Joint Policy Board shall meet at least quarterly to review and concur in the following topics:

"(a) The Association's budget;

"(b) The Association's legislative process and agenda;

"(c) The evaluation and supervision of the Association's executive director, and

"(d) Other nonlegislative policies that may be identified by the Council or the Presidents Commission."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Review NCAA Legislative Procedures) and NCAA Presidents Commission (Subcommittee on the Role and Structure of the Commission).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal not only will assure that the Presidents Commission is included in all of the major activities of the Association, but also will provide a clear indication to chief executive officers, the public, the news media and various governmental entities that the Association's chief executive officers do, in fact, participate in the direction of the major policy issues in the NCAA. It

will do so without involving chief executive officers in the day-to-day matters that are best handled by the professionals in the field and without undercutting or substantially reducing the roles of the other portions of the Association's administrative structure.

Action: Adopted (767-15, four abstentions), roll-call vote.

*** NO. 51 PROPOSED LEGISLATION — COMMITTEE REVIEW AND AMENDMENT LIMITATION**

Intent: To specify that all legislative proposals, regardless of source, shall be evaluated by an appropriate NCAA committee before they can be presented for action at an NCAA Convention, and to permit the Presidents Commission to specify that certain proposals contained in the Commission's legislative grouping shall not be amended for a period of two years subsequent to the effective date of the proposals, except as proposed by the Council or the Commission on an emergency basis or upon recommendation of the appropriate committee and approved for Convention consideration by a majority vote of the Council or the Commission.

A. Constitution: Amend 5.3 by adding new 5.3.6, page 35, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"5.3.6 Committee Review. All legislative proposals shall be evaluated by an appropriate NCAA committee before they can be included on the agenda for an NCAA Convention. Such evaluation may involve a position of support or opposition and/or a suggestion of an alternative proposal by the committee. The committee position, if any, shall not prevent the membership from voting on the proposal at the next Convention, provided all appropriate submission deadlines have been met.

"5.3.6.1 Committee Designation. The Administrative Committee shall assign each proposal to the appropriate committee(s) for evaluation and shall designate a Council subcommittee or special committee when no appropriate committee exists.

"5.3.6.2 Publication of Committee Position. The position of the appropriate committee shall be printed with the relevant proposal in the Official Notice of the NCAA Convention."

B. Constitution: Amend 4.5.3, page 23, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"4.5.3 Duties and Responsibilities. The Presidents Commission is empowered to:

[4.5.3-(a) through 4.5.3-(g) unchanged.]

"(h) Identify, prior to the Convention, specific proposals contained within the Commission's designated legislative grouping that shall not be amended for a period of two years subsequent to the effective date of the proposals, except per 5.1.4.3.1.1; and sponsor emergency legislative amendments to those proposals during the two-year amendment limitation period;"

[4.5.3-(h), relettered as 4.5.3-(i), unchanged.]

- C. **Constitution:** Amend 5.1.4.3 by adding new 5.1.4.3.1, page 29, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"5.1.4.3.1 Two-Year Amendment Limitation. The membership shall not consider during the appropriate two-year period amendments to proposals specified by the Presidents Commission as being subject to the two-year amendment limitation set forth in Constitution 4.5.3-(h).

"5.1.4.3.1.1 Exception. Upon the recommendation of an appropriate committee per 5.3.6, the Council or the Presidents Commission, by a majority of its members present and voting, may forward to the membership for consideration at the subsequent NCAA Convention amendments to proposals that are subject to the two-year limitation."

- D. **Constitution:** Amend 4.1.3, page 19, as follows

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"4.1.3 The Council is empowered to:

[4.1.3-(a) through 4.1.3-(f) unchanged.]

"(g) Sponsor emergency legislative amendments during the two-year amendment limitation period specified by the Presidents Commission per Constitution 4.5.3-(h) and 5.1.4.3.1."

[4.1.3-(g) and 4.1.3-(h), relettered as 4.1.3-(h) and 4.1.3-(i), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Review NCAA Legislative Procedures) and NCAA Presidents Commission (Subcommittee on the Role and Structure of the Commission).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will ensure that the implications of every legislative proposal will be evaluated carefully by the appropriate specialized NCAA committee(s), and that each proposal will be assessed in light of other legislation or proposed legislation to which it might relate. This evaluation might result in a compromise proposal or in the withdrawal of similar proposals and is intended to result in better legislation that requires less subsequent interpretation or amendment. It also will provide reasonable implementation periods for legislation considered by the Presidents Commission to be of major policy significance and will serve as a desirable step in stabilizing the Association's legislative process. It will assure chief executive officers and other institutional representatives that they do not have to return to the Convention each year to defend the legislation they already have sponsored successfully at prior Conventions.

Action: Part A adopted (536-252, three abstentions). Parts B through D defeated (321-463, 12 abstentions), roll-call votes.

NO. 52 REVISED LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

Intent: To revise the Association's legislative calendar by establishing

new submission and publication dates for legislative proposals.

Constitution: Amend 5.3, pages 32-37, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"5.3 AMENDMENT PROCESS

"5.3.1 Authorizing Legislation

[5.3.1.1 unchanged.]

"5.3.1.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. A proposed amendment to a provision of the constitution or bylaws may be amended at any annual or special Convention or at a division legislative meeting. From *July 1 through September 1* **July 15 through September 15**, sponsors of proposed legislation may refine and change proposals in any manner that is germane to the original proposal. After *September 1* **September 15** proposed amendments may be amended only if the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the provision to be amended.

[5.3.2 unchanged.]

"5.3.3 Submission Deadline

"5.3.3.1 Amendment. Deadline dates for receipt at the national office of proposed amendments are as follows:

"5.3.3.1.1 Amendment Proposed by Membership

"(a) Annual Convention - 5 p.m. Central time *July 1* **July 15 (conference-sponsored amendments must meet the July 15 deadline, and the required chief executive officer signatures for these proposals, per 5.3.2.1-(e), must be received by 5 p.m. Central time August 1).**

[5.3.3.1.1-(b) and 5.3.3.1.1-(c) unchanged.]

"5.3.3.1.1.1 Exception. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after *July 1* **July 15.**

"5.3.3.1.2 Amendments Sponsored by NCAA Council, Steering Committee or Presidents Commission.

"(a) Annual Convention - *August 15* **September 1.**

[5.3.3.1.2-(b) unchanged.]

"5.3.3.1.2.1 Exception. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after *August 15* **September 1.**

"5.3.3.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. Sponsors of proposed amendments must submit amendments to their original proposals in writing and such amendments must be received at the Association's national office not later than 5 p.m. Central time *September 1* **September 15**, unless the amendment-to-amendment does not increase the modification specified in the original proposal per 5.3.1.2. Any amendment to a proposed amendment submitted after *Sep-*

tember 1 **September 15** shall not increase the modification of the original proposal and must be submitted in writing and received at the Association's national office not later than 5 p.m. Central time *October 15* **November 1** preceding an annual Convention or 60 days preceding a special Convention.

[Remainder of 5.3.3.2 and 5.3.4 unchanged.]

“5.3.5 Notification to Membership

“5.3.5.1 Initial Publication. Proposed amendments shall be published for the information of the membership as follows:

“(a) Not later than August 1 August 15 - Those proposed by the membership, including the primary contact person's name, title and member institution or member conference, as well as the sponsors' statements of intent and rationale and any proposals designated for inclusion by the Council, its steering committees, or the Presidents Commission; and

“(b) Not later than September 15 September 23 - Those submitted by the Council, a steering committee or the Presidents Commission and those modified by sponsors per 5.3.3.2, or

[Remainder of 5.3.5.1 and 5.3.5.2 unchanged.]

“5.3.5.3 Delayed Date. If the Council establishes a date later than *July 1* **July 15** or *August 15* **September 1** for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention, it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for publishing copies of the proposed amendments for information of the membership.

“5.3.5.4 Amendment-to-Amendment. Copies of all amendments to proposed amendments submitted by the proposal's original sponsors pursuant to the *September 1* **September 15** deadline shall be published by *September 15* **September 23**. Copies of all other amendments to proposed amendments submitted by the *October 15* **November 1** deadline shall be published in the Official Notice of the Convention.”

[Remainder of 5.3 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Big Ten, Big West, Metro Atlantic, Mid-Continent, Old Dominion, Pacific-10 and Patriot League Conferences; all members of the Ivy Group; University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; University of Arkansas, Little Rock; Arkansas State University; Boston College; California State University, Fresno; University of Connecticut; East Carolina University; University of Florida; Gannon University; Jacksonville University; University of Kansas; Lamar University, and 15 other member institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current legislative calendar requires legislative proposals to be submitted during the summer immediately after the Collegiate Commissioners Association meetings and some conference meetings, and the review period for such proposals occurs later during the summer when many institutional representatives are absent from campus. The proposed legislative cal-

ender would permit the review process for membership-sponsored amendments to occur during the August 15-September 15 time period, when institutional representatives have returned to campus.

Action: Motion to refer to the Council and Presidents Commission approved (711-66, 10 abstentions), roll-call vote.

NO. 53 ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW PANEL

Intent: To establish an Administrative Review Panel to review appeals by member institutions of decisions made by an NCAA committee (excluding the Eligibility Committee and the Committee on Infractions) or the NCAA staff regarding the application of NCAA legislation to a particular situation.

A. Constitution: Amend 5.4.1 by adding new 5.4.1.8, page 38, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

“5.4.1.8 Administrative Review Process. An institution may appeal to the Administrative Review Panel a decision of an NCAA committee (excluding actions of the Eligibility Committee and the Committee on Infractions) or the NCAA staff regarding the application of NCAA legislation to a particular situation. In reaching its decision, the review panel shall review the complete record in order to determine whether there is sufficient basis to grant relief from the application of the legislation. The NCAA Council shall establish the process for such a review; shall monitor the actions taken under this authorization, and shall report annually to the membership the actions taken, in summary, aggregate form (see 21.3.3).”

B. Bylaws: Amend 21.3 by adding new 21.3.3, page 360, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

“21.3.3 Administrative Review Panel

“21.3.3.1 Composition. The Administrative Review Panel shall consist of five members, including a past NCAA president, a former member of the NCAA Committee on Infractions and a former member of the NCAA Eligibility Committee.

“21.3.3.2 Duties. The Administrative Review Panel shall be responsible for reviewing appeals by member institutions of decisions made by an NCAA committee (excluding actions of the Eligibility Committee and the Committee on Infractions) or the NCAA staff regarding the application of NCAA legislation to a particular situation. The panel shall review the complete record in order to determine whether there is sufficient basis to grant relief from the application of the legislation.”

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee to Review NCAA Legislative Procedures).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This legislation is a result of the adoption of 1992 Convention Proposal No. 117 and the apparently growing desire among the membership for increased flexibility in the application of NCAA legislation. The Council recognizes the concerns expressed in the past related to such flexibility, such as the possibility of numerous requests, the danger of inconsistent application of legislation in similar situations and the possibility of increased vulnerability to litigation. However, many of these same concerns were expressed when the establishment of an initial-eligibility waiver process was being contemplated but, over time, that process has developed into a manageable one with precedent that is followed as new cases arise.

Action: Part A adopted (772-16, six abstentions) Part B adopted by Division I (316-3, one abstention), Division II (195-7, one abstention) and Division III (252-3, eight abstentions), roll-call votes.

* NO. 54 COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS

Intent: To increase from six to eight the size of the Committee on Infractions and to specify that the two additional members shall be members of the general public.

Bylaws: Amend 19.1.1, page 322, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"19.1.1 Composition of Committee. The committee shall be composed of ~~six~~ **eight** members, ~~six of whom shall be~~ at present or previously on the staff of an active member or member conference of the Association, ~~two of whom shall be from the general public and shall not be associated with a collegiate institution, conference, or professional or similar sports organization, or represent coaches or athletes in any capacity, and one of whom shall serve as chair.~~ Two positions shall be allocated for men, two allocated for women and ~~two~~ **four** unallocated."

[Remainder of 19.1.1 unchanged.]

Source. NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions) and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The membership of the Committee on Infractions traditionally includes representatives from various Association constituencies: faculty athletics representatives, directors of athletics, commissioners, and professors and university administrators not associated with athletics. This jury of peers conducts administrative hearings in infractions cases. Additional members are needed to assist the committee in carrying out its duties related to preparation of written documents and when one or more members recuse themselves from the consideration of a case due to a potential conflict of interest. An expanded committee will enhance the ability to render informed and fair decisions, and the addition of members of the general public to the committee will provide a new perspective while also increasing public understanding of the process.

Action: Adopted by Division I (304-17, two abstentions), Division II

(187-12, two abstentions) and Division III (231-20, one abstention), roll-call votes.

* NO. 55 INFRACTIONS APPEALS COMMITTEE

Intent: To establish an Infractions Appeals Committee to replace the Council steering committees as the appellate body related to findings of major violations by the Committee on Infractions.

A. Bylaws: Amend 19.1.2, page 322, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"19.1.2 Authority of Committee. Disciplinary or corrective actions other than suspension or termination of membership may be affected during the period between annual Conventions by members of the Committee on Infractions present and voting at any duly called meeting thereof, provided the call of such a meeting shall have contained notice of the situation presenting the disciplinary problem. Actions of the committee in cases involving major violations, however, shall be subject to review by the *Council* **Infractions Appeals Committee** on appeal.

[19.1.2.1 and 19.1.2.2 unchanged.]

"19.1.2.3 Authority of *Council* **Infractions Appeals Committee.** The *division steering committee of the Council* representing the same division as an institution appealing the committee's findings of major violations **Infractions Appeals Committee** shall hear and act upon such an institution's appeal of the findings of major violations by the Committee on Infractions.

"19.1.2.4 Authority of *Council* **Infractions Appeals Committee.** The *division steering committee of the Council* representing the same division as an institution appealing the committee's findings of major violations **Infractions Appeals Committee** shall hear and act upon such an institution's appeal of the findings of the major violations by the Committee on Infractions."

[Remainder of 19.1.2 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 19 by adding new 19.2, page 323, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"19.2 INFRACTIONS APPEALS COMMITTEE

"The Council shall appoint an Infractions Appeals Committee, which shall hear and act upon appeals of the findings of major violations by the Committee on Infractions.

"19.2.1 Composition of Committee. The committee shall be composed of five members. At least one member shall be from the general public and shall not be connected with a collegiate institution, conference, or professional or similar sports organization, or represent coaches or athletes in any capacity. The remaining members shall presently or previously be on the staff of an active member institution or member conference, but shall not serve presently on the Council, Executive Committee or Presidents Commission.

"19.2.2 Authority and Duties of Committee. The com-

mittee shall hear and act upon appeals of the findings of major violations by the Committee on Infractions (see 32.8 and 32.9)."

C. **Bylaws:** Amend 19.3.1, page 323, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"19.3.1 For Major Violations. A member under investigation for major violations shall be given the following:

[19.3.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) An opportunity to appear before the Committee on Infractions (or respective division steering committee of the Council **Infractions Appeals Committee** upon appeal) to answer such charges by the production of evidence (see 19.5)."

D. **Bylaws:** Amend 19.4.2.1, page 324, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"19.4.2.1 Disciplinary Measures. Among the disciplinary measures, singly or in combination, that may be adopted by the committee (or the appropriate division steering committee of the Council **Infractions Appeals Committee** on appeal) and imposed against an institution for major violations are:"

[Remainder of 19.4.2.1 unchanged.]

E. **Bylaws:** Amend 19.5.2 and 19.5.3, page 327, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"19.5.2 Appeal of Major Violations. A member shall have the right to give written notice of appeal of the committee's findings of major violations (subject to 32.8.2), the penalty, or both to the division steering committee of the Council representing the same division as the institution making the appeal **Infractions Appeals Committee**."

"19.5.3 Appeal by an Institutional Staff Member. If any current or former institutional staff member participates in a hearing before the Committee on Infractions and is involved in a finding of violation of ethical conduct or in other findings by the committee resulting in proposed disciplinary action against that individual, the individual shall be given the opportunity by the institution involved in the proceeding to appeal through that institution any of the findings of question (subject to the conditions of 32.8.2) to the division steering committee of the Council representing the institution's division **Infractions Appeals Committee**. Under such circumstances, the individual and personal legal counsel may appear before the division steering appeals committee at the time it considers the pertinent findings."

F. **Bylaws:** Amend 21.3 by adding new 21.3.14, page 364, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"21.3.14 **Infractions Appeals Committee**. The **Infractions Appeals Committee** shall be appointed and its duties assigned as provided in 19.2 and 32. (See Bylaws 19 and 32 for details regarding the committee and the Association's enforcement process.)"

G. **Bylaws:** Amend 32.8 and 32.9, pages 434-435, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"32.8 APPEAL PROCEDURE

"32.8.1 Written Notice of Appeal. To be considered by the appropriate division steering committee of the Council **Infractions Appeals Committee**, the member institution's written notice of appeal of the committee's **Committee on Infractions'** findings (subject to the conditions of 32.8.2) or the penalty, or both, shall be received by the NCAA executive director not later than 15 calendar days from the date the member institution received the committee's report. The member's notice of appeal shall contain a statement of the date the committee's report was received by the chief executive officer and a statement indicating whether the institution desires to submit its appeal in writing only or whether the institution will be represented before the appropriate division steering committee of the Council **Infractions Appeals Committee** at the time the appeal is considered.

[32.8.2 unchanged.]

"32.8.3 Appeal by the Individual Staff Members. Any current or former institutional staff member who is involved in a finding of a violation of ethical conduct or in other findings by the committee resulting in proposed disciplinary action against that individual and who exercises the opportunity to appeal any of the findings in question (subject to the conditions of 32.8.2) must submit a written notice of appeal through the member institution to the NCAA executive director not later than 15 calendar days from the date the member institution received the committee's report. The individual and personal legal counsel may appear before the respective division steering committee of the Council **Infractions Appeals Committee** at the time it considers the pertinent findings. The institution shall be requested to notify its current staff members, and the enforcement staff will notify all other individuals directly, of the appeal opportunity.

"32.8.4 Report to Council **Infractions Appeals Committee**. The committee shall forward a report of the case to the Council **Infractions Appeals Committee** at the time of public announcement.

"32.8.5 Expanded Infractions Report on Occasion of an Appeal. The **Committee on Infractions** shall be obligated to submit an expanded infractions report to the Council **Infractions Appeals Committee** on each case that has been appealed and it shall include:

[Remainder of 32.8.5 unchanged.]

"32.8.6 Expanded Infractions Report to Institution and Media. A copy of the committee's **Committee on Infractions'** expanded infractions report to the **Infractions Appeals Committee** (as described in 32.8.5) shall be provided to the institution prior to the time of its appearance before the Council **Infractions Appeals Committee**. Once the Council decision of the **Infractions Appeals Committee** regarding the appeal is announced, the report, with names of individuals deleted, shall be made available to the national wire services and other media outlets. Any press release regarding the expanded report shall meet the requirements of 32.7.2.

"32.9 APPEAL HEARINGS

"32.9.1 Hearing Procedures. In its appeal to the *appropriate division steering committee of the Council* **Infractions Appeals Committee**, the member institution may challenge the committee's findings of fact or penalties, or both, according to the following hearing procedures:

[Remainder of 32.9.1 unchanged.]

"32.9.2 Consideration by *Council* **Infractions Appeals Committee**. The *appropriate division steering committee of the Council* **Infractions Appeals Committee** shall consider the statements and evidence presented and, at the discretion of any of its members, may question representatives of the member institution or the Committee on Infractions, as well as any other persons appearing before it, in order to determine the facts related to the appeal. Further, under the direction of *such steering committee* the **Infractions Appeals Committee**, questions and information may be exchanged between and among all parties participating in the hearing.

"32.9.3 *Council* **Infractions Appeals Committee** Determination of Hearing Procedures. The procedure to be followed in the conduct of the hearing will be determined by the *Council* **Infractions Appeals Committee**, however, the operating policies and procedures governing the determination of the individuals who may participate in the hearing, as well as the policies and procedures defining the *Council's* **committee's** standards for consideration of information and determination of findings and penalties, shall be consistent with the established policies and procedures related to these matters that apply to hearings conducted by the Committee on Infractions.

"32.9.4 Decision Final. Any *division steering committee* decision in an infractions case **by the Infractions Appeals Committee** shall be considered final *upon adjournment of the Council meeting during which the appeal was acted upon, except for the January pre-Convention Council meeting, in which case, the decision shall be considered final at the end of the Council session prior to the opening business session of the Convention.*

"32.9.5 No Further Review. Determinations of fact and violations arrived at in the foregoing manner by the **Committee on Infractions Committee**, or by a *division steering committee of the Council* the **Infractions Appeals Committee** on appeal, shall be final, binding and conclusive and shall not be subject to further review by the Council or any other authority."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions) and NCAA Presidents Commission.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: There seems to be general agreement that the current utilization of the divisional Council steering committees to hear infractions appeals imposes additional work upon a body already overburdened with a wide variety of responsibilities. It also has been suggested that institutions and involved individuals do not avail themselves of the current appeal process because of the belief that the Council steering committees merely ratify the

decisions of the Committee on Infractions. While the Committee on Infractions and the Council do not subscribe to these perceptions, there does appear to be merit in establishing an appellate body independent of the existing NCAA governing structure.

Action: Parts A, D and E adopted (781-6, one abstention). Parts B, C and F adopted by Division I (316-3), Division II (197-5) and Division III (257-1, two abstentions). Part G adopted (774-3, three abstentions), roll-call votes.

* NO. 56 RESOLUTION: DISCLOSURE OF GRADUATION RATES

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, during the 1990 NCAA Convention, the Association's membership adopted legislation, sponsored by the NCAA Presidents Commission, to require Divisions I and II member institutions to disclose graduation rates and enrollment information to the NCAA on an annual basis and to report that information to prospective student-athletes and their parents, coaches and guidance counselors pursuant to the recruiting process; and

"Whereas, the Federal government adopted similar legislation, known as the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act, in November of 1990, which requires member institutions annually to report graduation rates and enrollment information to the Department of Education, effective July 1, 1993; and

"Whereas, the NCAA membership, primarily through the NCAA Council and in consultation with the Commission, has revised the Association's legislation on this topic to ensure that the Association's disclosure and reporting requirements are substantially comparable to the requirements of the act; and

"Whereas, the Federal legislation specifies that the Secretary of Education shall permit collegiate institutions that are members of an athletics association that voluntarily publishes graduation-rates data that, in the opinion of the secretary, is substantially comparable to the reporting information specified in the act, to use such data to fulfill the requirements of the act; and

"Whereas, in July 1992, the Association voluntarily published Division I graduation-rates data that appeared to be substantially comparable to the requirements of the act and will forward data to the Department of Education in July 1993 for all three membership divisions that appears to be substantially comparable to the requirements of the act; and

"Whereas, unless the Secretary issues to the Association a waiver of substantial comparability prior to the July 1, 1993, federal reporting deadline, member institutions also will be subject to the disclosure provisions specified in the act; and

"Whereas, it is not now predictable whether the Secretary will issue final regulations to implement the act in time to clearly identify the act's specific reporting requirements in a timely manner;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the membership of the NCAA reconfirms its support of the legitimacy of the Association's commitment to gather and disclose graduation rates and enrollment information; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Association's membership by adoption of this resolution reconfirms its support for the Association's substantial and on-going efforts regarding this matter, including the pending submission of a 'substantial comparability' waiver request to the Secretary on behalf of all member institutions, and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that the NCAA Council is instructed to take all steps necessary to communicate with the Secretary regarding this matter prior to the applicable July 1, 1993, Federal deadline."

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission (Special Advisory Committee to Review Implementation of 1990 Convention Proposal No. 24).

Action: Adopted (768-8, three abstentions), roll-call vote.

* **NO. 57 RESOLUTION: FINANCIAL ISSUES**

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, the NCAA Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council have addressed in the past three NCAA Conventions various means by which the costs of conducting athletics programs might be contained or reduced; and

"Whereas, the general financial condition of college athletics continues to be a matter of concern throughout the NCAA membership; and

"Whereas, the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics identified financial integrity as one of the key elements in the reform of intercollegiate athletics; and

"Whereas, the 1992 Convention approved a resolution directing a study of all elements affecting financial control and financial integrity of college athletics, with that study to be concluded not later than June 1993 in order that any appropriate legislation might be presented to the 1994 Convention; and

"Whereas, the Presidents Commission, in consultation with the Council and other constituencies, appointed a Special NCAA Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics to conduct the study as specified in the 1992 Convention resolution;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Presidents Commission and the Council be directed to consider the recommendations of the special committee in their respective summer meetings in 1993 and to submit appropriate legislation for action at the 1994 Convention."

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission (Subcommittee on Strategic Planning).

Action: Adopted (771-6, four abstentions), roll-call vote.

* **NO. 58 RESOLUTION: THE STUDENT-ATHLETE: WELFARE, ACCESS AND EQUITY**

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, a basic principle of the NCAA, as set forth in its constitution, is that intercollegiate athletics programs shall be conducted in a manner designed to protect and enhance the physical and educational welfare of student-athletes; and

"Whereas, many of the legislative actions supported by the NCAA Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council in recent years have

attempted to promote the welfare of student-athletes by enhancing their academic preparation, including their right to make normal progress toward a college degree; by reducing the athletically related time demands placed on them, and by affording them an opportunity to enjoy a collegiate experience in the same manner as other students; and

"Whereas, other entities in the NCAA structure are charged with consideration of additional matters affecting student-athlete welfare, such as gender and racial equity; physical safety, health and well being, and appropriate opportunities for financial aid;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Commission, in consultation with the Council and other constituencies, be directed to conduct a study of all welfare, access and equity issues that affect student-athletes, including a review of the effects of earlier legislation in these areas, and to conclude the study not later than June 1994 in order that any appropriate legislation might be presented to the 1995 NCAA Convention."

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission (Subcommittee on Strategic Planning).

Action: Adopted (774-4, one abstention), roll-call vote.

NO. 59 RESOLUTION: GRANTS-IN-AID FOR WOMEN'S SPORTS

[All divisions, common vote, roll call]

"Whereas, the March 1992 NCAA Gender-Equity Study indicates that funding for women's programs and female participants historically is lower than that for men's programs; and

"Whereas, based on the study, men's participation exceeds women's participation by a ratio of two to one; and

"Whereas, the newly formed NCAA Task Force on Gender Equity has been established specifically to review and bring forth legislative recommendations on this topic;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council direct the task force to review Bylaw 15.5.2 and study the impact of changing head-count sports for women to equivalency sports, including how this change would increase opportunities for women to participate in intercollegiate athletics; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the task force develop recommendations and legislation on this topic to be presented to the Council for sponsorship at the 1994 NCAA Convention."

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Action: Withdrawn.

Personnel

NO. 60 RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH

Intent: To include compensation from any employment by a representative of the institution's athletics interests and any other athletically related compensation in the compensation limitations for the restricted-earnings coach.

Bylaws: Amend 11.02.3, pages 47-48, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.02.3 Restricted-Earnings Coach. A restricted-earnings coach is any coach who is designated by the institution's athletics department to perform coaching duties and who serves in that capacity on a volunteer or paid basis with the following limitations on earnings derived from the member institution:

"(a) During the academic year, a restricted-earnings coach may receive compensation or remuneration from the institution's athletics department or any organization funded in whole or in part by the athletics department or that is involved primarily in the promotion of the institution's athletics program (e.g., booster club, athletics foundation association) that is not in excess of either \$12,000 or the actual cost of educational expenses incurred as a graduate student enrolled in the institution's graduate program from the following sources:

"(1) The institution's athletics department;

"(2) Any organization funded in whole or in part by the athletics department or that is involved primarily in the promotion of the institution's athletics program (e.g., booster club, athletics foundation association);

"(3) Any employment by a representative of the institution's athletics interests, and

"(4) Any other compensation or remuneration that is athletically related (e.g., camps, speaking engagements).

"(b) During the summer, a restricted-earnings coach may receive compensation or remuneration (total remuneration shall not exceed \$4,000) from:

"(1) The institution's athletics department or any organization funded in whole or in part by the athletics department or that is involved primarily in the promotion of the institution's athletics program (e.g., booster club, athletics foundation association);

"(2) The institution's camp or clinic;

"(3) Camps or clinics owned or operated by institutional employees, or

"(4) Another member institution's summer camp

"(2) Employment by a representative of the institution's athletics interests, or

"(3) Any other compensation or remuneration that is athletically related (e.g., camps, speaking engagements).

[11.02.3-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) During the academic year or the summer, compensation for employment from a source outside the institution during the academic year or from sources other than those specified under 11.02.3-(b) and 11.02.3-(c) above during the summer that is not athletically related and not from employment by a representative of the institution's athletics interests shall be excluded from the individual's limit on remuneration."

[Remainder of 11.02.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The restricted-earnings category was created as part of the reform movement to reduce costs in intercollegiate athletics. In enacting the restricted-earnings coaching category, the membership was attempting to establish a coaching category to encourage the development of new coaches while more effectively limiting compensation provided to such coaches. There are many gaps in the original legislation that caused a proliferation of interpretations related to the types of activities for which the restricted-earnings coach could be compensated. Most of the interpretations resulted from efforts being made to retain current experienced personnel by supplementing the allowable compensation from the athletics department. Such efforts have, at times, resulted in outside groups, particularly booster groups, arranging for and providing questionable employment for restricted-earnings coaches. This proposal will ensure the principle of competitive equity and more accurately reflect the intent of the original legislation.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 61 COACHING LIMITATIONS—DIVISION I

Intent: In sports other than football and basketball, to permit an institution that employs an individual as a head or assistant coach in one sport to count that individual as a restricted-earnings coach in a second sport.

Bylaws. Amend 11.7.4.1 by adding new 11.7.4.1.4, page 66, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.7.4.1.4 Assistant/Restricted-Earnings Coaches. In sports other than football and basketball, a coach designated as a head or assistant coach in one sport may be designated as a restricted-earnings coach in a second sport without being subject to the limitations specified in 11.02.3."

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: This amendment will permit institutions to further reduce coaching costs by decreasing the total number of individuals who must be employed as coaches.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 62 RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACHES—DIVISION I-AA

Intent: To permit Division I-AA institutions to add two restricted-earnings coaches, provided the compensation from sources specified in 11.02.3-(a) for all restricted-earnings coaches does not exceed \$24,000 per academic year

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.3, page 64, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"11.7.3 Division I-AA Football. There shall be a limit of seven head or assistant coaches and **two four** restricted-earnings coaches that may be employed by the institution in the sport of Division I-AA football. **The total compensation from sources specified in 11.02.3-(a) for all four restricted-earnings coaches may not exceed \$24,000 per academic year.**"

Source: All members of the Southern Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This amendment will permit Division I-AA institutions to take advantage of two additional restricted-earnings coaches without changing the total amount of compensation currently allowed for restricted-earnings coaches during the academic year. Division I-AA football student-athletes often need additional instruction, inasmuch as their skills initially may not be well refined. This legislation is intended to allow two additional restricted-earnings coaches to assist with the development of such skills.

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA (52-41, two abstentions).

NO. 63 DIVISION I-AA COACHING LIMITATIONS— CONTACT AND EVALUATION OF PROSPECTS OFF CAMPUS

Intent: In Division I-AA football, to permit an institution to specify that one restricted-earnings coach may replace one full-time coach for purposes of off-campus recruiting.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.3.2, page 64, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"11.7.3.2 Off-Campus Contact and Evaluation of Prospects. Off-campus contact and evaluation of prospects is limited to *the head or assistant coaches* **a total of seven coaches, which may include the head coach and not more than one restricted-earnings coach. A list of permissible off-campus recruiters shall be designated prior to October 1. The annual designation of the restricted-earnings coach shall remain in effect for the academic year or until the restricted-earnings coach no longer is employed by the institution.**"

Source: All members of the Big Sky Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Permitting not more than one restricted-earnings coach to recruit off campus will allow an institution to have a full-time staff member on campus at all times to be available to student-athletes and to address academic issues.

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA.

NO. 64 RECRUITING—DIVISION I BASKETBALL

Intent: To permit all three full-time Division I men's and women's basketball coaches to recruit off campus during the summer evaluation period.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.5.1, page 66, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.7.5.1 Contact and Evaluation of Prospects Off Campus. There is a limit on the number of institutional coaching staff members who may contact or evaluate prospects off campus at any one time as follows:

"Sport	Limit
Basketball, Men.....	2 (during the academic year)
	3 (during the summer)
Basketball, Women	2 (during the academic year)
	3 (during the summer)"

[Remainder of 11.7.5.1 unchanged.]

Source: Ball State University; Bradley University; Central Connecticut State University; East Tennessee State University; George Mason University; Ohio State University; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; Texas Tech University; Villanova University; Washington State University, and Western Illinois University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The intent of prior legislation to reduce the number of coaches permitted to recruit off campus was to reduce costs; however, allowing coaches to recruit off campus during the July recruiting period is exponentially more cost effective. Because of the large number of summer camps, coaches can see literally hundreds of players at one site, as opposed to having to take a series of trips to see only a small number of athletes. Sometimes three coaches can car pool and save even more costs. When only two coaches can be away, it is increasingly difficult to take advantage of the cost savings possible by a Saturday layover. Having a coach on campus during the summer is not as important an academic safeguard as it is during the academic year. Allowing three coaches to recruit during the summer also enhances the quality of recruiting decisions, which, in turn, promotes more cost effective use of scholarship dollars.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 65 COACHING LIMITATIONS

Intent: To redefine the individuals that must be included in an institution's coaching limitations in each sport.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.1.1.1.1, page 62, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.7.1.1.1.1 *Department-Wide Responsibilities.* Athletics department staff members who perform department-wide responsibilities (e.g., recruiting coordinator who coordinates recruiting for all intercollegiate sports conducted by the institution or an academic counselor who counsels student-athletes in all sports) shall be excluded from the limitations on the number of coaches in any one sport. However, that individual (other than the weight coach per 11.7.2.1.1, 11.7.3.1.1 and 11.7.4.1.1) may not be involved in on-the-field coaching and may not recruit or evaluate prospects or scout opponents off campus unless he or she counts against the coaching limits for head coaches and full-time assistant coaches. **Noncoaching Activities. Institutional staff members involved in noncoaching activities**

(e.g., administrative assistants, recruiting coordinators, academic counselors) do not count in the institution's coaching limitations, provided such individuals are not identified as coaches, do not engage in any on- or off-field coaching activities (e.g., attending meetings involving coaching activities, analyzing videotape or film involving the institution's or an opponent's team), and are not involved in any off-campus recruitment of prospects or scouting of opponents."

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: At the 1991 Convention, Division I institutions adopted legislation, effective August 1, 1992, to reduce the number of coaching personnel in the sports of football and basketball, and to establish numerical coaching limitations in all other sports. Following the adoption of that legislation, a concern arose that institutions were reassigning individuals who previously counted against coaching limitations in an effort to avoid counting such individuals as coaches in the applicable sports. This practice results in minimal (if any) cost savings and provides an unfair competitive advantage for those institutions that continue to utilize the coaching expertise of such individuals. This result was not contemplated nor intended when the legislation was adopted. Further, there has been additional concern that the absence of a definitive standard of what constitutes "department-wide responsibilities" has permitted individuals to perform duties almost entirely in one sport without being included in an institution's coaching limitations in that sport. This new standard, recommended by the Interpretations Committee and the Council, more accurately reflects the intent of the legislation that established coaching limitations and provides a more workable definition for determining which individuals should be included in an institution's coaching limits.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 66 PROFESSIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMS

Intent: To permit athletics department staff members from all divisions to participate in established, formal professional enhancement programs administered by professional sports organizations; to permit participating staff members to receive compensation and expenses consistent with that received by other program participants, and to specify that the Council shall establish necessary policies and guidelines regarding participation by an institution's staff members in such a program

Bylaws: Amend 11.3.3.2 by adding new 11.3.3.2.4, page 53, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"11.3.3.2.4 Established Professional Enhancement Program. A staff member may participate in an established, formal program administered by a professional sports organization and designed to enhance the skills associat-

ed with the staff member's profession. A staff member participating in the program may receive direct compensation (including stipends) and expenses from the sponsoring organization, consistent with the compensation and expenses received by other program participants. The Council shall establish necessary policies and guidelines regarding participation by an institution's staff members in such a program."

Source: NCAA Council (Minority Interests and Opportunities Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will permit coaches to participate in established, formal professional enhancement programs, such as the NFL Minority Coaches Fellowship Program, that are a benefit to all individuals and organizations that participate in those programs.

Action: Adopted by all three divisions.

NO. 67 COACHES — ENDORSEMENT OF NONINSTITUTIONAL PUBLICATIONS

Intent: To preclude athletics department staff members from endorsing (orally or in writing) any noninstitutional publication dedicated solely to reporting on an institution's athletics activities and to prohibit athletics department staff members from writing for or receiving any remuneration from such publications.

Bylaws: Amend 11.3.2 by adding new 11.3.2.7, page 52, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"11.3.2.7 Noninstitutional Publications that Report on Athletics Program. Athletics department staff members shall not endorse (either orally or in writing) any noninstitutional publication dedicated solely to reporting on an institution's athletics activities and shall not write for or receive any remuneration from such publications."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Recently, there has been a proliferation of noninstitutional publications dedicated solely to reporting on the athletics activities of specific member institutions. Many of these publications provide compensation to athletics department staff members in return for public endorsements of the publications. Such a practice appears to be contrary to the principle set forth in Bylaw 11.3.2.6 precluding athletics department staff members from receiving compensation for promoting outside commercial entities that produce items that contain the names and pictures of student-athletes. Further, many of these outside publications provide information about the athletics abilities of prospective student-athletes. This proposal will eliminate any appearance that institutions receive an unfair recruiting advantage through

the association of staff members with such publications.
Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 68 COACHES — SCOUTING-SERVICE CONSULTANT

Intent: To preclude an institution's athletics department staff member from serving as a consultant or participating on an advisory panel for any recruiting or scouting service.

Bylaws. Amend 11.3.2 by adding new 11.3.2.9, page 53, as follows.
[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"11.3.2.9 Scouting Service Consultants. Institutional athletics department staff members may not serve as consultants or participate on advisory panels for any recruiting or scouting service."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will promote equity in the recruiting process by eliminating the perception that institutions receive a recruiting advantage if a coach or other athletics staff member is involved in any manner with a scouting or recruiting service.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

Eligibility

NO. 69 INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — TEST-SCORE REQUIREMENT

Intent. To apply on a retroactive basis (for participation only) the establishment of an ACT score of 17, as opposed to 18, as the minimum composite score required for initial eligibility in Divisions I and II.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1, pages 130-131, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.3.1.1 Qualifier, Basic Requirements. A qualifier is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following academic qualifications:

[14.3.1.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) A minimum 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections, or a minimum composite score on the ACT of 15 (if taken prior to October 28, 1989) or 18 17 (if taken on or subsequent to October 28, 1989) or 17 (for student-athletes who took the test subsequent to October 28, 1989, and who are first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1992). The required SAT or ACT score must be achieved under national testing conditions on a national testing date [i.e., no residual (campus) testing or regional testing dates]."

[Remainder of 14.3.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: Brigham Young University; California State University, Fresno; Colorado State University; University of Connecticut;

DePaul University; Eastern Illinois University; University of Hawaii; Iowa State University; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of New Mexico; New Mexico State University; Northeast Louisiana University; Sam Houston State University; University of Texas at Arlington; University of Texas at El Paso; U.S. Air Force Academy; University of Utah; Wichita State University, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Traditionally, many changes in NCAA eligibility standards have been applied on a retroactive basis to the benefit of a student-athlete. This issue requires a balancing of equitable treatment for individual student-athletes versus a recruiting/competitive advantage issue for institutions. The current effective date of the change from 18 to 17 in the minimum required ACT score results in identical test-score performances by student-athletes in different years being treated differently. The retroactive application (for participation only) of the 17 ACT test score to all students achieving at least a 16.5 since October 28, 1989, better balances the interests of these student-athletes. The proposal would not permit student-athletes to retroactively receive financial aid for those years during which they were initially considered to be nonqualifiers.

Action: Adopted by Division I; defeated by Division II.

NO. 70 SEASONS OF COMPETITION—PARTIAL QUALIFIER AND NONQUALIFIER

Intent: To permit nonqualifiers and partial qualifiers in Division I to earn a fourth season of intercollegiate competition, provided they have completed satisfactorily the minimum number of semester or quarter units established pursuant to the Association's satisfactory-progress legislation.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.3 by adding new 14.3.3.1, page 139, as follows:
[Division I only]

"14.3.3.1 Fourth Season of Competition — Division I. A fourth season of intercollegiate competition shall be granted to a nonqualifier or partial qualifier, provided that at the beginning of the fifth academic year following the student-athlete's initial full-time collegiate enrollment, the student-athlete has completed satisfactorily the minimum number of semester or quarter units established pursuant to the Association's satisfactory-progress legislation. This provision shall be administered by the member conferences of the Association or, in the case of an independent institution, by the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee."

Source: All members of the Ivy Group; University of Connecticut; Georgetown University; University of Oklahoma; University of Pittsburgh; Providence College, and Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The purpose of this legislation simply is to permit a student-athlete to earn a fourth season of eligibility after the student has proven his or her academic abilities by virtue of successfully completing the minimum number of semester or quarter units established pursuant to the Association's satisfactory-progress legislation. The membership of Division I has placed a firm and rigid initial-eligibility requirement on student-athletes and has gone one step further in disallowing athletics participation during the partial qualifier's and nonqualifier's first academic year. It seems inappropriate not to allow these students to earn a fourth season of competition by virtue of sound academic progress equal to that required of our other student-athletes. The studies on the academic performance of student-athletes, which place special emphasis on the effect of the Association's initial-eligibility legislation, should continue but in the meantime, this inequity should be dealt with fairly.

Action: Motion to require roll-call vote approved. Defeated by Division I (148-164, six abstentions). Motion to reconsider defeated (137-148, one abstention).

NO. 71 INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — CHANGE IN SPORT CLASSIFICATION

Intent: To specify that during the 1993-94 academic year only, Division III freshman eligibility requirements will continue to apply to a Division I or II sport that was classified in Division III during the 1992-93 academic year, provided the institution continues to apply Division III financial aid guidelines in that sport during the 1993-94 academic year.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.4 by adding new 14.3.1.4.1, page 134, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.3.1.4.1 Exception — Change in Sport Classification. During the 1993-94 academic year only, the freshman academic requirements set forth in Bylaw 14.3 shall not apply to a Division I or Division II sport that was classified in Division III during the 1992-93 academic year, provided the institution continues to apply Division III financial aid guidelines (per Bylaw 15.4) in that sport during the 1993-94 academic year."

Source: NCAA Council.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Divisions I and II institutions that currently are playing Division III football and plan to continue those programs in Division I or Division II need an opportunity to "gear up" their admissions and registrars' offices to certify the initial eligibility of additional student-athletes. These schools are not likely to be in contention for the Division I-AA or Division II championships now or in the near future. This proposal would be a means of saving these institutions significant costs that otherwise would be required as a result of this mandated reclassification, especially if the membership adopts legislation to establish an initial-eligibility clearinghouse during the subsequent academic year.

Accordingly, the sponsors intend to withdraw this proposal if the membership fails to approve the establishment of the initial-eligibility clearinghouse during the 1993-94 academic year.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 72 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY—CHANGE IN SPORT CLASSIFICATION

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who participated in a sport classified in Division II or III while enrolled in a Division I institution prior to August 1, 1993, to complete the student's eligibility in that sport in accordance with the Division II or III eligibility standards.

Bylaws: Amend 14.01, by adding new 14.01.6, page 120, as follows:
[Division I only]

"14.01.6 Student-Athlete Participating in Division II or Division III Sport While Enrolled in Division I. A student-athlete who participated in a sport classified in Division II or Division III while enrolled in a Division I institution prior to August 1, 1993, and who remains enrolled in that institution, shall remain subject to the applicable Division II or Division III eligibility legislation."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference and the Patriot League, University of Dayton, Illinois State University and Marist College.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: With the failure of the Division I-AAA football proposal at the 1992 Convention, effective September 1, 1993, all Division I member institutions that currently sponsor Division II football or Division III nonscholarship football will be required to reclassify their football programs to Division I-AA, if they wish to continue to sponsor those programs. Because of this change in divisional status, a limited number of student-athletes may be adversely affected during this transition by the application of the more restrictive rules of Division I. Adoption of this proposal will ensure that those athletes will be allowed to complete their football eligibility in accordance with the applicable Division II or III eligibility standards.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 73 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY—CHANGE IN SPORT CLASSIFICATION

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who participated in a sport classified in Division III while enrolled in a Division II institution prior to August 1, 1993, to complete the student's eligibility in that sport in accordance with the Division III eligibility standards.

Bylaws: Amend 14.01 by adding new 14.01.6, page 120, as follows:
[Division II only]

"14.01.6 Student-Athlete Participating in Division III

Sport While Enrolled in Division II Institution. A student-athlete who participated in a sport classified in Division III while enrolled in a Division II institution prior to August 1, 1993, and who remains enrolled in that institution shall remain subject to the applicable Division III eligibility legislation."

Source: Assumption College; Bentley College; Gannon University; Long Island University/C.W. Post Campus; University of Massachusetts, Lowell; Mercyhurst College; Pace University; Sacred Heart University, and Stonehill College.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: With the failure of the Division I-AAA football proposal at the 1992 Convention, effective September 1, 1993, all Division II member institutions that currently sponsor Division III nonscholarship football will be required to reclassify their football programs to Division II, if they wish to continue to sponsor those programs. Because of this change in divisional status, a limited number of student-athletes may be adversely affected during this transition by the application of the more restrictive rules of Division II. Adoption of this proposal will ensure that those athletes will be allowed to complete their football eligibility in accordance with the applicable Division III eligibility standards.

Action: Adopted by Division II.

NO. 74 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY — DRUG TESTING

Intent: To specify that all student-athletes who test positive for a banned drug during an initial positive drug test will lose at least one season of competition or the equivalent of one season of competition during their period of ineligibility.

A. Bylaws: Amend 18.4.1.5.1, page 317, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"18.4.1.5.1 Duration of Ineligibility. A student-athlete who tests positive (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) shall be charged with the loss of a minimum of one season of competition in all sports if the season of competition has not yet begun for that student-athlete or a minimum of the equivalent of one full season of competition in all sports if the student-athlete tests positive during his or her season of competition (i.e., the remainder of contests in the current season and contests in the subsequent season up to the period of time in which the student-athlete was declared ineligible during the previous year). The student-athlete shall remain ineligible for all regular-season and postseason competition during the time period ending one calendar year (i.e., 365 days) after the student-athlete's positive drug test, and until the student-athlete retests negative (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) and the student-athlete's eligibility is restored by the Eligibility Committee. If the student-athlete tests positive for the use of any drug, other than a 'street drug' as defined in 31.2.3.1, after being restored to eligi-

bility, he or she shall lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports. If the student-athlete tests positive for the use of a 'street drug' after being restored to eligibility, he or she shall be charged with the loss of a minimum of one additional season of competition in all sports and also shall remain ineligible for regular-season and postseason competition at least through the next calendar year."

B. Bylaws: Amend 31.2.3, page 404, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"31.2.3 Ineligibility for Use of Banned Drugs. Bylaw 18.4.1.5 provides that a student-athlete who is found to have utilized a substance on the list of banned drugs shall be declared ineligible for further participation in postseason and regular-season competition during the time period ending one calendar year after the student-athlete's positive drug test, and shall be charged with the loss of a minimum of one season of competition in all sports if the season of competition has not yet begun for that student-athlete or a minimum of the equivalent of one full season of competition in all sports if the student-athlete tests positive during his or her season of competition (i.e., the remainder of contests in the current season and contests in the subsequent season up to the period of time in which the student-athlete was declared ineligible during the previous year). The student-athlete shall remain ineligible until the student-athlete retests negative (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) and the student-athlete's eligibility is restored by the Eligibility Committee. If the student-athlete tests positive for the use of any drug, other than a 'street drug' as defined below, after being restored to eligibility, he or she shall lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports. If the student-athlete tests positive for the use of a 'street drug' after being restored to eligibility, he or she shall lose a minimum of one additional season of competition in all sports and also shall remain ineligible for regular-season and postseason competition at least through the next calendar year. Bylaw 18.4.1.5 also provides that the Executive Committee shall adopt a list of banned drugs and authorize methods for drug testing of student-athletes on a year-round basis."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal affirms the precedents established by the NCAA Eligibility Committee in administering this legislation since its amendment in 1990. It will ensure that student-athletes who test positive for a banned drug during an initial positive drug test will experience the loss of at least one season of competition or the equivalent of one full season of competition during their period of ineligibility. It was the intent of 1990 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 52 that a student-athlete who is ruled ineligible for a minimum one-year period as a result of an initial positive drug test would experience the loss of "game

time" at some point during that period. This legislation will preclude a student-athlete who tests positive prior to engaging in competition for that academic year from merely sitting out during the minimum one-year period of ineligibility and not losing a season of competition. Further, it will require a student-athlete who tests positive during the middle of his or her playing season to be declared ineligible for the remainder of regular-season and postseason competition, as well as for contests in the subsequent season up to the period of time in which the student-athlete was declared ineligible during the previous year. For example, if a student-athlete in the sport of football is declared ineligible after the fifth game of competition, the student-athlete would be precluded from competing in the remaining six games during the current 11-game schedule, as well as during the first five games of the subsequent season.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 75 ELIGIBILITY — SEASON-OF-COMPETITION WAIVER

Intent. To permit the Eligibility Committee to grant an additional season of competition to a student-athlete who has participated in a limited amount of competition as a result of relying in good faith on an erroneous, formal declaration of eligibility by the institution's appropriate certifying authorities.

Bylaws. Amend 14.2 by adding new 14.2.6, page 130, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.2.6 Season-of-Competition Waiver. In conjunction with a request for restoration of eligibility and any conditions imposed thereon per Bylaw 14.14, a student-athlete may be granted an additional season of competition by the Eligibility Committee when he or she participated in a limited amount of competition as a result of a good-faith, erroneous formal declaration of eligibility by the institution's appropriate certifying authority. The competition must have occurred under all of the following conditions:

- "(a) The competition occurred while the student-athlete was representing an NCAA member institution;**
- "(b) The competition occurred within 60 days of the date the student-athlete first reported for athletics participation;**
- "(c) The student-athlete did not participate in more than two events or 10 percent (whichever number is greater) of the institution's completed events in his or her sport. All competition (including a scrimmage) against outside participants shall be countable under this limitation in calculating both the number of events in which the student-athlete participated and the number of completed events during that season (traditional and nontraditional) in the sport, and**
- "(d) The student-athlete was involved innocently and inadvertently in the erroneous declaration of eligibil-**

ity, which permitted the student-athlete to compete while ineligible.

"14.2.6.1 Administrative Criteria. The following criteria shall be employed in the administration of the season of competition waiver:

"14.2.6.1.1 Ten-Percent Calculation. The requirements specified in Bylaw 14.2.5.3.4 shall apply to the 10-percent calculation specified in this waiver.

"14.2.6.1.2 Application Deadline. The institution shall submit its request for a waiver not later than 60 days from the date on which the institution first has knowledge that the student-athlete competed while ineligible."

Source. NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Currently, no mechanism exists to grant an additional year of competition for a student-athlete except for hardships related to injury or illness. The Eligibility Committee believes that relief also is appropriate when circumstances indicate that a student-athlete has lost a season of competition due to a good-faith mistake made by the institution for which the student-athlete is in no way responsible. However, the committee also is concerned about the number of waiver requests and the potential abuses that may occur with the implementation of such a waiver. Therefore, this proposal is limited in scope and does not apply to student-athletes who merely participated in a limited number of contests, who participated in an event that could be considered intercollegiate competition in a technical sense, or participated at the direction of an institution's coach without a formal declaration of eligibility. Rather, this waiver would grant relief only in those situations in which an error occurred in the institution's formal certification process that resulted in a student-athlete participating in a limited number of contests over a short period of time.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 76 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

Intent: In Division I, to permit women who initially enrolled in a collegiate institution prior to the time the NCAA began offering women's championships (1981-82 academic year) to utilize the 10-semester/15-quarter rule, as opposed to the five-year rule.

Bylaws. Amend 14.2.1 by adding new 14.2.1.5, page 126, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.2.1.5 Female Student-Athletes Who Enrolled Prior to 1981-82. A female student-athlete whose initial collegiate enrollment occurred prior to the establishment of women's championships by the NCAA (1981-82 academic year) shall not be subject to the five-year rule but shall be subject to the 10-semester/15-quarter rule specified in 14.2.2."

Source: All members of the West Coast Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The moving force behind this proposal is a situation that occurred at a member institution in the fall of 1991. A woman who enrolled as a full-time student at a junior college in 1962 and attended only one semester as a full-time student returned to junior college in 1989 and then transferred to an NCAA member institution in the fall of 1991. She was informed that she was not eligible to compete for the institution's cross country team because of the five-year rule. This proposal will allow for a more common-sense approach to matters of individual eligibility involving women who initially enrolled at a collegiate institution prior to the time that the NCAA assumed the administration of women's athletics.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 77 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY—GRADUATE STUDENT

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who has graduated and is continuing as a full-time student at the same institution to remain eligible while taking course work that would lead to the equivalent of another major or degree.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.8.2, page 125, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"14.1.8.2 Postbaccalaureate. A student-athlete who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school of the institution he or she previously attended as an undergraduate (regardless of whether the individual has received a baccalaureate degree), or a student-athlete who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, **or a student-athlete who has graduated and is continuing as a full-time student at the same institution while taking course work that would lead to the equivalent of another major or degree as defined and documented by the institution**, may participate in intercollegiate athletics, provided the student has eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within the applicable five-year or 10-semester period set forth in 14.2."

[Remainder of 14.1.8.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council; University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Auburn University; University of Georgia; University of Kentucky; Louisiana State University; University of Mississippi; University of South Carolina, Columbia; University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and Vanderbilt University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Some institutions do not grant a second undergraduate degree subsequent to graduation. This proposal will encourage student-athletes who have completed their degree requirements not to postpone graduation simply to participate in a final season of competition.

Action: Adopted by all three divisions.

NO. 78 ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION—DIVISION I-AA

Intent: In the sport of football, to permit a student-athlete to utilize the one-time transfer exception when transferring from Division I-A to Division I-AA.

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.5.3.10, pages 154-155, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"14.6.5.3.10 One-Time Transfer Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution and all of the following conditions are met:

"(a) The student is a participant in a sport other than Division I basketball, Division I-A or I-AA football, or Division I men's ice hockey. **A participant in Division I-AA football must have transferred to the certifying institution from an institution that sponsors Division I-A football.**"

[Remainder of 14.6.5.3.10 unchanged.]

Source: McNeese State University, Nicholls State University, North Texas State University, Northeast Louisiana University, Northwestern State University (Louisiana), Sam Houston State University, Southwest Texas State University and Stephen F. Austin State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Current NCAA legislation permits a student participating in the sport of football to utilize the provisions of the one-time transfer exception when transferring from a Division I-A or I-AA institution to an institution sponsoring the sport of football in Division II or III. This proposal will permit similar use of this exception only for a student transferring from a Division I-A institution to a Division I-AA institution.

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA; motion to rescind defeated (two-thirds vote of entire membership required), 368-242, 21 abstentions.

NO. 79 TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY — DIVISION II

Intent: To specify that in Division II, a two-year college transfer who was a nonqualifier or partial qualifier must have attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least two semesters or three quarters to be eligible for practice and competition during the first academic year in residence, and to specify that a two-year college transfer student who was a nonqualifier must have attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least two semesters or three quarters to be eligible for athletics aid.

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.4.2, page 150, as follows:

[Division II only]

"14.6.4.2 To Division II Institutions.

"14.6.4.2.1 **Qualifier.** A transfer student from a two-year college **who was a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1)** is eligible in

Division II institutions for competition during the first academic year in residence only if the student has:

- "(a) Graduated from the two-year college, or
- "(b) Presented a minimum of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (see 14.6.4.4.3.2) and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the two-year college (excluding summer sessions).

"14.6.4.2.2 Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier. A transfer student from a two-year college who was not a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) is eligible in Division II institutions for practice and competition (and for nonqualifiers, for athletics aid) during the first academic year in residence only if the student has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least two semesters or three quarters and has:

- "(a) Graduated from the two-year college, or**
- "(b) Presented a minimum of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (see 14.6.4.4.3.2)."**

[14.6.4.2.1, renumbered as 14.6.4.2.3, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1993; for those student-athletes first entering a two-year college on or after August 1, 1993.

Rationale: This proposal will help to close a loophole that exists currently in the application of two-year transfer eligibility legislation to nonqualifiers and partial qualifiers.

Action: Adopted by Division II.

NO. 80 TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFER — DIVISION II

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

Intent: To permit a two-year college transfer who competes in a sport at the two-year college and transfers to a Division II institution during the same academic year to be eligible for regular and postseason competition in that sport.

Bylaws: Amend 14.6.4.4.7, page 152, as follows:

[Division II only]

"14.6.4.4.7 Competition in Year of Transfer. A transfer student from a two-year college is not eligible for regular-season or NCAA championship competition in a sport if the student-athlete has competed at the two-year college in that sport during the same academic year."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Under current legislation, a student-athlete who transfers from a four-year institution during the academic year could represent both four-year institutions in outside competition dur-

ing the same academic year, provided the student-athlete meets an exception to the transfer residence requirement. Thus, it seems fair to afford a two-year college transfer the same opportunity, regardless of whether the student-athlete participated at the two-year college during the same academic year.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 81 OUTSIDE COMPETITION—DIVISION II

Intent: In Division II, to eliminate restrictions on outside competition during the academic year in sports other than basketball following the conclusion of the playing season.

Bylaws: Amend 14.8.1.1 and 14.8.1.2, page 156, as follows:

[Division II only]

"14.8.1.1 Divisions I and II. In Divisions I and II, a student-athlete in any sport other than basketball who participates during the academic year as a member of any outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition becomes ineligible for intercollegiate competition in that sport for the remainder of the year and for the next academic year (see 14.8.5 and 14.8.6 for exceptions and waivers). A student-athlete is permitted to practice on such a team.

"14.8.1.2 Divisions II and III. A Division II or III student-athlete shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition for the remainder of the season in his or her sport (other than basketball) if, following enrollment in college and during any year in which the student-athlete is a member of an intercollegiate squad or team, he or she competes or has competed as a member of any outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., tournament play, exhibition games or other activity) during the institution's intercollegiate season in the sport (see 14.8.5 and 14.8.6 for exceptions and waivers)."

Source: All members of the California Collegiate Athletic Association.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The California Collegiate Athletic Association believes that 14.8.1.1 is not necessary in Division II and that its effect could be very harmful to Division II competition. Funding at the majority of Division II schools in the sports involved is limited, and the competition in which a student-athlete is involved outside the institution certainly increases the student-athlete's athletics potential.

Action: Adopted by Division II.

Financial Aid

NO. 82 ON-CAMPUS EMPLOYMENT

Intent: To indicate that earnings from on-campus employment outside the athletics department during the academic year count as institutional financial aid only if the athletics interests of the

institution intercede on behalf of the student-athlete.

Bylaws: Amend 15.02.3.1, page 162, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.02.3.1 Institutional Financial Aid. The following sources of financial aid are considered to be institutional financial aid:

"(a) All funds administered by the institution (e.g., scholarships, grants, loans, work-study program assistance, on-campus employment **in the athletics department, on-campus employment outside the athletics department for which the athletics interests of the institution intercede on behalf of the student-athlete**, tuition waivers);"

[Remainder of 15.02.3.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The purpose of this legislation is to treat on-campus earnings consistent with the criterion used for counting off-campus employment earnings. Further, concerns regarding abuses that led to the current rule that on-campus employment earnings are considered institutional financial aid may be outdated and no longer offer sufficient reason for the existing restriction.

Action: Defeated (two-thirds vote of entire membership required), 368-242, 21 abstentions).

NO. 83 FINANCIAL AID—INDIVIDUAL LIMITATION

Intent: To permit a student-athlete whose eligibility has been exhausted to work during the term of attendance following completion of eligibility in his or her primary sport without a reduction in the student-athlete's grant-in-aid.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.6.3, page 168, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15.2.6.3 Year After Eligibility Exhausted. Employment earnings of a student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility in a particular sport during the prior academic year **a prior term** shall be exempt from this limitation, provided the student-athlete subsequently does not practice or compete in intercollegiate athletics."

Source: All members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: This proposal is a natural extension of the current rule and permits a student-athlete in a fall sport to exempt employment earnings during the spring after eligibility has been exhausted. It retains the safeguard that a student-athlete utilizing this exemption may not practice or compete again in intercollegiate athletics.

Action: Adopted by Division I; not moved in Division II.

NO. 84 EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS—DIVISION II

Intent: To permit Division II student-athletes to earn legitimate off-

campus employment income in excess of a full grant-in-aid, provided neither athletics department staff members nor representatives of the institution's athletics interests were involved in arranging the employment.

A. Bylaws. Amend 15.1.1, pages 164-165, as follows:

[Division II only]

"15.1.1 Types of Aid Included in Limit. In determining whether a student-athlete's financial aid exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid, all institutional financial aid (per 15.02.3.1) and all funds received from the following and similar sources shall be included:

"(a) Employment. Employment during semester or term time (which is an all-inclusive period from the opening to the closing of classes of the regular semester, quarter or term, except for vacation periods listed in the institution's official calendar **and except for the legitimate off-campus employment of Division II student-athletes**) (also see 15.2.6);"

[Remainder of 15.1.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.6 by adding new 15.2.6.1, page 168, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II only]

"15.2.6.1 Exception — Division II Employment Earnings. Earnings from a Division II student-athlete's legitimate off-campus employment in excess of a full grant-in-aid shall be exempt, provided neither athletics department staff members nor representatives of the institution's athletics interests are involved in arranging the employment."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Division II Steering Committee conducted a survey of the Division II membership in the fall of 1991. The results of that survey were reported to the Division II membership during the Division II business session at the 1992 NCAA Convention. Of the 134 respondents to the survey, 61.9 percent agreed that off-campus employment income should not be included in determining whether a Division II student-athlete's financial aid exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid. This proposal will allow a Division II student-athlete to work during the academic year and not have the employment earnings count against the value of a full grant-in-aid, provided neither athletics department staff members nor representatives of the institution's athletics interests are involved in arranging the employment.

Action: Adopted by Division II.

NO. 84-1 EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS—DIVISION II

Intent: To exclude the sports of football and men's and women's basketball from the proposed legislation.

A. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 84-A, 15.1.1, as follows:

[Division II only]

"15.1.1 Types of Aid Included in Limit. In determining whether a student-athlete's financial aid exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid, all institutional financial aid (per 15.02.3.1) and all funds received from the following and similar sources shall be included.

"(a) Employment. Employment during semester or term time (which is an all-inclusive period from the opening to the closing of classes of the regular semester, quarter or term, except for vacation periods listed in the institution's official calendar and except for the legitimate off-campus employment of Division II student-athletes in sports other than football and men's and women's basketball) (also see 15.2.6):"

[Remainder of 15.1.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 84-B, 15.2.6.1, as follows.

[Division II only]

"15.2.6.1 Exception — Division II Employment Earnings. In sports other than football and men's and women's basketball, earnings from a Division II student-athlete's legitimate off-campus employment in excess of a full grant-in-aid shall be exempt, provided neither athletics department staff members nor representatives of the institution's athletics interests are involved in arranging the employment."

Source: Central Missouri State University; Emporia State University; University of Missouri, Rolla; Missouri Southern State College; Northwest Missouri State University; Pittsburg State University; Southwest Baptist University, and Washburn University of Topeka.

Rationale: Football and basketball, in general, are the sports with the greatest number of full grants-in-aid awarded. Because of the high profile of these sports, legitimate concerns arise for the potential difficulty of maintaining institutional control and preventing abuse in administering the proposed employment-earnings legislation.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 85 STATE RECIPROCITY TUITION AGREEMENTS

Intent: To require that state reciprocity agreements be considered institutional financial aid.

Bylaws: Amend 15.02.3.1, page 162, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.02.3.1 Institutional Financial Aid. The following sources of financial aid are considered to be institutional financial aid:

"(a) All funds administered by the institution (e.g., scholarships, grants, loans, work-study program assistance, on-campus employment, tuition waivers, state reciprocity tuition agreements):"

[Remainder of 15.02.3.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale. Under current NCAA legislation, state reciprocity tuition agreements are not considered institutional financial aid, thus creating competitive inequities at the conference and national levels for those institutions that have reciprocal tuition agreements with neighboring states; however, this proposal would eliminate these inequities

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 86 FINANCIAL AID—GRADATION OR CANCELLATION

Intent. To permit a member institution to graduate or cancel a student-athlete's financial aid on the date that the student-athlete voluntarily withdraws from a sport.

Bylaws. Amend 15.3.4.1, pages 171-172, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.3.4.1 Gradation or Cancellation Permitted. Institutional financial aid may be graduated or canceled during the period of the award if the recipient:

[15.3.4.1-(a) through 15.3.4.1-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Voluntarily withdraws from a sport for personal reasons. If the recipient withdraws from a sport for personal reasons prior to the institution's first competition in that sport, gradation or cancellation may occur immediately; however, the recipient's financial aid may not be awarded to another student-athlete in the term in which the aid was graduated or canceled. If the recipient withdraws subsequent to the institution's first competition in that sport, the gradation or cancellation shall not occur prior to the conclusion of that semester or quarter may occur on or after the date the student-athlete voluntarily withdraws from the sport."

[Remainder of 15.3.4.1 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Lone Star Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current rules mandate that a student-athlete who withdraws subsequent to the institution's first competition must continue to receive financial aid until the end of the current semester or quarter. The proposed change will allow member institutions to graduate or cancel the student-athlete's aid effective the date the student-athlete voluntarily withdraws from a sport, thus preventing the institution from being forced to continue to pay expenses for former athletes who have chosen not to participate in their sport.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 87 FINANCIAL AID—PELL GRANT

Intent: To permit student-athletes to receive Pell Grant assistance in combination with other institutional financial aid, provided the overall grant total does not exceed the value of a full grant plus \$2,400, or the student-athlete's cost of attendance, whichever is less.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.4.1, page 167, as follows:

[Division I only]

"15.2.4.1 Pell Grants. A student-athlete may receive a Pell Grant in combination with other institutional financial aid, provided the overall grant total does not exceed the value of a full grant-in-aid plus \$1,700 **\$2,400** in Division I institutions or \$900 in Division II or Division III institutions, or the student-athlete's cost of attendance per 15.01.7 (in Division I institutions, as determined by the institution's regular financial aid authority), whichever is less."

Source: NCAA Council; University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; Boston College; Brigham Young University; University of Florida; Georgia Institute of Technology; University of Kansas, Louisiana State University; University of Oklahoma; University of Pittsburgh; Syracuse University; Texas A&M University, and Texas Tech University

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The U.S. government recently adopted legislation that will permit the amount an individual may receive from a Pell Grant to be increased. NCAA regulations should reflect such an increase, especially in difficult economic times that could have the greatest impact on lower income families.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 88 RESOLUTION: DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL SCHOLARSHIP LIMITS

[Note: Upon the recommendation of the parliamentarian, the chair ruled the following proposal out of order. The sponsors asked that the proposal be circulated in order to challenge the chair's ruling.]

[Division I-AA football only]

"Whereas, Division I-AA football has voted to reduce total grants-in-aid from a maximum of 70 to a maximum of 63; and

"Whereas, these annual grant-in-aid limits are maximums that do not preclude an individual institution or conference from opting to offer less than the maximum permissible number of grants-in-aid; and

"Whereas, a significant number of Division I-AA institutions rely annually on playing one to three football contests against Division I-A institutions for financial and public relations reasons; and

"Whereas, any further reduction of grants-in-aid in Division I-AA football without a similar reduction in Division I-A football will reduce the competitiveness of these particular Division I-AA programs against Division I-A institutions to the degree that such programs would lose their fan appeal; and

"Whereas, the Division I membership is in the midst of major restructuring that will become effective in August 1994; and

"Whereas, with the failure of the legislation to establish a Division I-AAA football classification, Division I-AA must deal effectively with meeting the needs of those 27 Division I institutions that will be moving from lower football classifications into Division I-AA, and

"Whereas, it is likely that the increased requirement for mini-

mum grants-in-aid in sports other than football and basketball and the increased interest in gender equity will emphasize the need for the support of sports other than football; and

"Whereas, at the spring meeting of Division I-AA athletics directors and football coaches, overwhelming support existed to maintain 'three-deep' grant-in-aid limits for Division I-AA football;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that grant-in-aid limits in Division I-AA football should not be reduced for a two-year period following the reduction of the grant-in-aid limits from 70 to 63 during the 1994-95 academic year so that Division I-AA institutions may maintain their support base in football while permitting them to work to legislate effectively to meet the consequences of the Division I membership changes and to determine the full effect of membership restructuring, gender equity and other changes that will affect the division."

Source: All members of the Southern Conference.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 89 HONORARY ACADEMIC AWARDS — DIVISION II

Intent: To include honorary academic awards and research grants in the determination of the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid and cost attendance for a Division II student-athlete.

A. Bylaws Amend 15.02.3.3, page 164, as follows

[Division II only]

"15.02.3.3 Exempted Institutional Financial Aid. The following institutional financial aid is exempt and is not counted in determining a student-athlete's full grant-in-aid or in the institution's financial aid limitations:

"(a) An honorary award for outstanding academic achievement or an established institutional research grant that meets the criteria set forth in 15.02.5 (and in Divisions I and III **all divisions** must be included in determining if the student-athlete's cost of attendance has been met);"

[Remainder of 15.02.3.3 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.02.5, page 164, as follows:

[Division II only]

"15.02.5 Honorary Academic Awards/Research Grant. An honorary academic award for outstanding academic achievement or a research grant is an award that meets the following criteria:

[15.02.5-(a) through 15.02.5-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) In Divisions I and III **all divisions**, the award or grant is included in determining if the student-athlete's cost-of-attendance limitation has been met."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The effect of 1992 Convention Proposal No. 70 that was adopted by the Division II membership was the elimination of the cost of attendance limitation for honorary academic awards

and research grants. The Division II Steering Committee is concerned about the potential abuse that could result from the adoption of this legislation.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 90 FINANCIAL AID—DIVISION II MEN'S LACROSSE

Intent: To permit student-athletes participating in Division II men's lacrosse to receive only noncountable financial aid.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.2, pages 179-180, as follows:
[Division II only]

"15.5.3.2 Division II Maximum Equivalency Limits. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.3.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in each Division II sport, as follows:

"Men's Sports

"Lacrosse 10.8 0"

[Remainder of 15.5.3.2 unchanged.]

Source: Concordia College (New York), Dowling College, Mercy College, Molloy College, Queens College (New York), Pace University, Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science and Southampton Campus of Long Island University.

Effective Date: July 1, 1995.

Rationale: The majority of schools participating in Division II lacrosse formerly participated at the Division III level. This amendment is a cost-containment measure and an attempt to create a common financial aid philosophy among the participants in Division II lacrosse. There are only 18 schools listed as sponsoring Division II lacrosse. This proposal may encourage other schools in Division II to sponsor lacrosse.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 91 MAXIMUM AWARDS — DIVISION II

Intent: To "round-off" the equivalency limitations in all Division II sports other than football and basketball, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.2, pages 179-180, as follows:
[Division II only]

"15.5.3.2 Division II Maximum Equivalency Limits. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.3.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in each Division II sport, as follows:

"Men's Sports:

Cross Country/Track	12.6	12.5	Rifle	3.6	3.5
Golf	3.6	3.5	Skiing	6.3	6.0
Gymnastics	5.4	5.5	Swimming	8.1	8.0
Lacrosse	10.8	11.0			

"Women's Sports:

Cross Country/Track	12.6	12.5	Golf	5.4	5.5
Field Hockey	6.3	6.0	Lacrosse	9.9	10.0

Skiing	6.3	6.0	Softball	7.2	7.0
Soccer	9.9	10.0	Swimming	8.1	8.0

[Remainder of 15.5.3.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The Division II membership adopted 1992 Convention Proposal No. 64, which reduced the permissible number of grants in selected Division II sports by 10 percent. Of the 134 respondents to the Division II survey, 82.1 percent felt that new legislation in Division II has resulted in an unrealistic administrative burden on Division II institution staffs, and the area of financial aid was cited as an example where this increased burden has been felt. The steering committee believes that it will be much easier to calculate equivalencies if numbers are rounded off as specified.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 92 ACADEMIC HONOR AWARDS — DIVISION III

Intent: To confirm that an academic honor award may include additional, nonacademic criteria, provided the additional criteria are not based on athletics ability or participation and the award is consistent with such awards provided to all students.

Bylaws: Amend 15.4.6.2.1, page 173, as follows:
[Division III only]

"15.4.6.2.1 Additional Requirements. The following additional academic honor requirements shall be met:

"(a) The awards may include additional, nonacademic criteria (e.g., interviews, essays), provided the additional criteria are not based on athletics ability or participation and the awards are consistent with such awards provided to all students;"

[15.4.6.2.1-(a) through 15.4.6.2.1-(c), relettered as 15.4.6.2.1-(b) through 15.4.6.2.1-(d), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will confirm that an institution may include nonacademic criteria, such as interviews and essays, in the administration of academic honor awards, provided the criteria are not based on athletics ability or participation.

Action: Adopted by Division III.

NO. 93 NONATHLETICS ACHIEVEMENT AWARDS

Intent. To specify that recipients of nonathletics achievement awards must be selected by a committee of the faculty of an academic department, division or school of the institution, and that an athletics department staff member may not be a member of the committee that determines which students receive the awards.

Bylaws. Amend 15.4.6.4, page 173, as follows:

[Division III only]

"15.4.6.4 Nonathletics Achievement Awards. The Council shall have the authority to approve requests from Division III institutions to grant nonathletics achievement awards to student-athletes. **Recipients of such awards must be selected by a committee composed predominantly of the faculty of an academic department, division or school of the institution, and an athletics department staff member may not be a member of the committee that determines which students receive the awards.** Competition for such an award must be among all members of the student body in general who meet certain publicized qualifications, the award must have no relationship to athletics ability or participation, the institution may establish no quota for such awards for student-athletes, the form utilized by a student-athlete to apply for such an award must have no reference to athletics ability or participation, the award must be identified in the appropriate institutional publication listing financial aid awards available to all students, and the award must be consistent with Bylaw 15 4.9. The Council shall establish a process for granting requests for approval of nonathletics achievement awards; shall monitor the actions taken under this authorization, and shall report annually to the membership the actions taken in summary, aggregate form."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal merely codifies criteria used by the Council to review and approve nonathletics achievement awards.

Action: Adopted by Division III.

Playing and Practice Seasons

NO. 94 SQUAD LIMITS—DIVISION I MEN'S SPORTS

Intent: To establish annual limitations on the number of participants in Division I men's sports. [Note: This proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

A. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.2 through 17.21, pages 216-311, for each sport (except football) by adding a section entitled "Limitations on Number of Participants," as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.____ Limitations on Number of Participants — Men's Sports.

"17.____.1 **Limitation on Number of Participants — Men's Sports.** Each institution, within the first two weeks of preseason practice, shall limit the number of student-athletes who may participate each year in men's sports as follows:

"Baseball.....33	Ice Hockey.....26	Tennis.....10
Basketball.....14	Lacrosse.....36	Track (Indoor/ Outdoor).....40
Cross Country.....14	Rifle.....9	Volleyball.....19
Fencing.....21	Skiing.....26	Water Polo.....23
Golf.....12	Soccer.....26	Wrestling.....28"
Gymnastics.....14	Swim/Diving.....26	

B. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.7 by adding new 17.7.10, page 247, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"17.7.10 **Limitation on Number of Participants.** Each institution, within the first two weeks of preseason practice, shall limit the number of student-athletes who may participate in Division I-A football to 105."

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Establishing annual limits on squad sizes in men's sports will help moderate program costs. The proposed limits are based on a 10 percent reduction in the national average of Division I-A participants, as reported in the NCAA Gender Equity Study.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 94-1 SQUAD LIMITS — DIVISION I MEN'S SPORTS

Intent: To specify that the proposed squad-size limits apply only to varsity squads and to specify that varsity squad limits shall be established prior to the first competition in each sport.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 94-A, 17.____.1, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.____.1 **Limitation on Number of Participants — Men's Sports.** Each institution, within the first two weeks of preseason practice prior to its first varsity competition in each sport, shall limit the number of student-athletes who may participate each year in varsity men's sports as follows:"

[Remainder of 17.____.1 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Rationale: This proposal will permit institutions to continue to sponsor junior varsity programs.

Action: Not moved.

NO. 95 SUMMER COMPETITION—INDIVIDUAL SPORTS

Intent: In individual sports, to eliminate limitations on the number of student-athletes from the same institution who may practice or compete during the summer on an outside, amateur team [Note: This proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

Bylaws: Amend 17.4 through 17.21, pages 229-311, for each individual sport by amending the respective section entitled "Noncollegiate, Amateur Competition — Out of Season," as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.____.8.1 Noncollegiate, Amateur Competition

"17.____.8.1.4 **Out of Season.** In individual sports, there shall be no limits on the number of student-athletes with eligibility remaining from the same member

institution who voluntarily may practice or compete during the summer on an outside, amateur team."

Source: Brigham Young University; State University of New York at Buffalo; College of Charleston; University of Notre Dame; University of Southern California; Southern Connecticut State University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Only team sports should have restrictions on the number of currently eligible players who may practice and compete on outside, amateur sports teams during the summer because there is an inherent advantage in team sport players having the opportunity to play and practice together. This advantage does not exist in individual sports; therefore, similar limitations should not be imposed. Individual sport student-athletes should be allowed freedom of choice in selecting their summer training environment.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 96 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Intent: To permit practice and competition for one postseason non-NCAA championship in each non-NCAA championship sport used by an institution for sports sponsorship purposes pursuant to Bylaws 20.9.3 and 20.9.3.2.1, thereby providing an exemption to the playing and practice seasons established in those sports.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.8, pages 211-212, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.1.8 General Regulations for Computing Playing Seasons Applicable to All Sports.

[17.1.8-(a) through 17.1.8-(g) unchanged.]

"(h) Non-NCAA Postseason Championships Participation. Practice and/or competition in non-NCAA (or non-NAIA) postseason championships (e.g., an invitational tournament scheduled after a conference championship) must be counted against the institution's declared playing-season limitation; **except that practice and competition for one postseason championship in each non-NCAA championship sport used for sports sponsorship purposes pursuant to Bylaws 20.9.3 and 20.9.3.1, is exempt from the institution's declared playing-season limitation in the sport, and**"

[Remainder of 17.1.8 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the West Coast Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal simply addresses a fine-tuning detail as a result of membership restructuring. It will establish the same playing-season exemption that is permitted for NCAA champi-

onships in NCAA sports to be applied to non-NCAA championship sports used for sports sponsorship purposes.

Action: Adopted by all three divisions.

NO. 97 FIRST CONTEST DATE—DIVISION I BASEBALL

Intent: To establish March 1 as the first permissible contest date during the traditional segment in Division I baseball.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.2.3, pages 216-217, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.2.3 First Contest Date. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in each segment in baseball prior to the following dates:

"17.2.3.1 Traditional Segment

"(a) **Division I — March 1.**

"(a) (b) Divisions I and II — September 7."

[17.2.3.1-(b), relettered as 17.2.3.1-(c), and remainder of 17.2.3, unchanged.]

B. Resolution

[Division I only]

"Whereas, the existing playing season in Division I baseball significantly undermines the Presidents Commission's emphasis on academics by forcing institutions to schedule the majority of their games in a short period of time just prior to and during final examination periods and by scheduling up to seven games per week, and

"Whereas, in no other collegiate sport is there such a disparity in the playing conditions due to weather, which could be addressed by a more flexible playing schedule and a uniform starting date for all programs; and

"Whereas, a right inherent in institutional membership is the opportunity to participate in an NCAA championship, and in the last 22 years, only one member institution from a non-sunbelt state has won the NCAA Division I Baseball Championship; and

"Whereas, college baseball could become a revenue-producing sport, while not costing athletics departments additional revenue and, at the same time, remain responsive to the academic concerns identified by the Presidents Commission;

"Now, Therefore Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Executive Committee direct the governing sports committees to address the inequity existing in Division I college baseball by declaring a uniform starting date and allowing each member institution the flexibility in scheduling games so as to avoid conflicts with the student-athletes' academic schedules; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Association direct the governing sports committees to address the equity and feasibility of formatting a championship playing schedule that allows a minimum of 14 weekends (Saturdays and Sundays) for regular-season play before conference tournaments and other postseason play begin."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Bradley University; Brigham Young University; Campbell University; Canisius College; Illinois State University; Indiana State University; University of Kentucky; University of Maine; University of Northern Iowa; University of Notre Dame; Ohio State University; University of Oklahoma; Old Dominion University; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; University of Southern Mississippi; Southwest Missouri State University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Tulsa; Western Illinois University, and Wichita State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale. The sponsors are submitting this proposal in conjunction with their desire that the College World Series be conducted in late June or early July. This proposal would adjust the spring semester playing season so that existing academic constraints on the student-athlete would be reduced and also establish a uniform starting date for all Division I baseball programs. The legislation will minimize class time missed due to competition and allow the spring playing schedule to accommodate final examination periods. The cost savings for those institutions that choose to eliminate spring trips would be significant. The sponsors contend that there will be an increase in summer school enrollment by the athletes, which, in effect, will increase the graduation rate and allow baseball players to progress at a yearly academic rate similar to traditional students. By reducing the weather element now existing in college baseball, the proposal provides an opportunity for true national championship tournaments, thus enhancing the long-standing NCAA principle of competitive equity.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 97-1 FIRST CONTEST DATE — DIVISION I BASEBALL

Amend Proposal No. 97-B, as follows:

[Division I only]

"Whereas, the existing playing season in Division I baseball significantly undermines the Presidents Commission's emphasis on academics by forcing institutions to schedule the majority of their games in a short period of time just prior to and during final examination periods and by scheduling up to seven games per week; and

"Whereas, in no other collegiate sport is there such a disparity in the playing conditions due to weather, which could be addressed by a more flexible playing schedule and a uniform starting date for all programs; and

"Whereas, a right inherent in institutional membership is the opportunity to participate in an NCAA championship, and in the last 22 years, only one member institution from a non-sunbelt state has won the NCAA Division I Baseball Championship; and

"Whereas, college baseball could become a revenue-producing sport, while not costing athletics departments additional revenue and, at the same time, remain responsive to the academic concerns identified by the Presidents Commission;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Executive Committee direct the governing sports committees to address the inequity existing in Division I college baseball by declaring a uniform starting date and allowing each member institution the flexibility in scheduling games so as to avoid conflicts with the student-athletes' academic schedules; and

"Be It Further **Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved**, that the Association direct the governing sports committees to address the equity and feasibility of formatting a championship playing schedule that allows a minimum of 14 weekends (defined as having both Saturdays and Sundays) for regular-season play before conference tournaments and other postseason play begin, and

"Be It Further Resolved, that recommendations on this matter be forwarded by the sports committees to the Executive Committee not later than August 1, 1993."

Source: Bradley University; Illinois State University; Indiana State University; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; Southwest Missouri State University; University of Tulsa; Western Illinois University, and Wichita State University.

Action: Not moved.

NO. 98 FIRST CONTEST DATE—DIVISION I BASKETBALL

Intent: To specify that a Division I institution may play its first basketball contest on the Friday immediately following Thanksgiving.

Bylaws: Amend 17.3.3, page 222, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in basketball prior to the following dates, except as provided under 17.3.3.1.

"(a) Division I — December 1 The Friday immediately following Thanksgiving."

[Remainder of 17.3.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council; all members of the Big Ten, Missouri Valley and Pacific-10 Conferences; University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Auburn University; Boston College; Brigham Young University; Cleveland State University; University of Dayton; Duke University; Duquesne University; University of Florida; University of Kentucky; La Salle University; Louisiana State University; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Northeast Louisiana University; Northern Arizona University; Providence College, and St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania).

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Permitting the first date of competition to occur on the Friday immediately following Thanksgiving, rather than December 1, is sound academically because school is not in session during the Thanksgiving holiday. Shortening the competitive season while keeping the number of games constant only created a busier December schedule, forcing student-athletes to play more games prior to and/or during the final examination period.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 99 FIRST CONTEST DATE EXCEPTION—
DIVISION I BASKETBALL**

Intent: To permit Division I institutions to participate in the Maui Invitational men's basketball tournament prior to December 1 (e.g., Thanksgiving weekend).

Bylaws: Amend 17.3.3.1-(c), page 222, as follows.
[Division I only]

"(c) USA Basketball, Tip-Off Classic, Foreign-Team Games, Great Alaska Shootout, **Maui Invitational**. The following basketball games may be played after November 15 by a Division I institution and after November 1 by a Division II or III institution:

[17.3.3.1-(c)-(1) through 17.3.3.1-(c)-(5) unchanged.]

"(6) **For Division I members only, all games in the Maui Invitational men's basketball tournament sponsored by an active member located in Hawaii.**"

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; University of California, Santa Barbara; University of Cincinnati; University of Connecticut; DePaul University; University of Evansville; Indiana University, Bloomington; Louisiana State University; Memphis State University; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; University of Missouri, Columbia; Ohio State University; University of Oklahoma; University of Toledo, and Wichita State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Hawaii's Maui Invitational Basketball Tournament has been conducted during the Thanksgiving holiday period annually since its inception in 1984. It was moved to December in 1992 as necessitated by a change in NCAA legislation affecting the start of the basketball playing season. Returning the tournament to the Thanksgiving holiday period will minimize loss of class time and reduce conflicts with final examination periods while preserving conference and institutional in-season scheduling practices and objectives. It also will serve to alleviate the compact December scheduling pattern that now is a problem for many NCAA institutions and conferences. This proposal also will permit an even greater cross-section of institutions to participate in the tournament, which is a long-time objective of tournament management. To date, the tournament has afforded 47 different institutions from 27 different states and 20 different athletics conferences this unique competitive and educational experience. Finally, the approval of this proposal would be consistent with the Council-endorsed approval granted the Great Alaska Shootout Tournament by the 1992 NCAA Convention.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 100 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS—DIVISION I
BASKETBALL**

Intent: To permit a Division I institution located outside of Hawaii to exempt annually not more than four contests (if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Hawaii) or one tournament (not

to exceed three contests), against or sponsored by an active Division I member institution located in the state of Hawaii.

A. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.3.5.2, pages 226-227, as follows:
[Division I only]

"17.3.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests each year shall exclude the following:

[17.3.5.2-(a) through 17.3.5.2-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) **Hawaii Contests. Not more than four contests (if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Hawaii) or one tournament (not to exceed three contests) by an institution located outside Hawaii either against an active Division I member institution or sponsored by an active Division I member institution located in Hawaii.**"

[17.3.5.2-(d) through 17.3.5.2-(f), relettered as 17.3.5.2-(e) through 17.3.5.2-(g), unchanged.]

B. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.3.5.3.2, page 227, as follows:
[Division I only]

"17.3.5.3.2 Additional Division I Options. Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting towards the maximum number of basketball contests:

"(a) **Hawaii or Alaska Contests. Not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Alaska or Hawaii) or one tournament (not to exceed three contests), by a member institution located outside the area in question, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member located in Alaska or an active Division II member institution located in Hawaii;**"

[Remainder of 17.3.5.3.2 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Big West and Western Athletic Conferences, and Western Illinois University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The University of Hawaii is located 2,500 miles from the nearest Division I institution. To maintain a viable athletics program, special scheduling considerations are essential. Moving the Hawaii exemption from the once-in-four-year section to the once-every-year section creates incentives to play in Hawaii. Less than 16 of the 298 Division I basketball-playing institutions would be able to use this exemption in any one year. Hawaii has a limited number of nonconference games. Additionally, it would be rare for Hawaii to invite any program to participate in its tournament more than once in four years. Currently, schools that qualify for the preseason National Invitation Tournament, take a foreign tour or play in Alaska or Puerto Rico (not Division I institutions) cannot use the Hawaii exemption during the same four-year period. This greatly reduces the number of home institutions eligible to use the Hawaii exemption and reduces the number of home contests Hawaii can schedule. If Hawaii cannot fill its home schedule needs, it must play more

games on the road, creating losses in revenue, increases in expenses and more classes missed by its student-athletes.

Action: Adopted by Division I as amended by 100-1.

NO. 100-1 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I BASKETBALL

Intent: To limit the proposed exemption for Division I basketball contests in Hawaii against or under the sponsorship of a Division I member institution located in Hawaii to once in four years.

A. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 100-A, 17.3.5.2, as follows:
[Division I only]

"17.3.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests each year shall exclude the following:
[17.3.5.2-(a) through 17.3.5.2-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) *Hawaii Contests* Not more than four contests (if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Hawaii) or one tournament (not to exceed three contests) by an institution located outside Hawaii either against an active Division I member institution or sponsored by an active Division I member institution located in Hawaii"

[17.3.5.2-(e) through 17.3.5.2-(g), relettered as 17.3.5.2-(d) through 17.3.5.2-(f), unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 100-B, 17.3.5.3.2, as follows:
[Division I only]

"17.3.5.3.2 Additional Division I Options.

"17.3.5.3.2.1 Basic Options. Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests:

[17.3.5.3.2-(a) (as amended) through 17.3.5.3.2-(d), renumbered as 17.3.5.3.2.1-(a) through 17.3.5.3.2.1-(d), unchanged.]

"17.3.5.3.2.2 Division I Member Institution in Hawaii Option. Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Hawaii) or one tournament (not to exceed three contests) by a member institution located outside Hawaii, either against or under the sponsorship of an active Division I member institution located in Hawaii."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Rationale: The Council believes it is more consistent with the reform objectives of reducing time demands on student-athletes and institutional costs to permit institutions to exempt contests in Hawaii against or under the sponsorship of an active Division I member located in Hawaii once every four years as opposed to every year.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 101 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS—DIVISION I BASKETBALL

Intent: To permit Division I institutions to exempt annually the

A-116 _____ 1993 Convention Proceedings

Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game from their maximum number of basketball contests.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.2, pages 226-227, as follows:
[Division I only]

"17.3.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests each year shall exclude the following:
[17.3.5.2-(a) through 17.3.5.2-(e) unchanged.]

"(f) **Tip-Off Classic. For Division I only, the Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game.**"

[17.3.5.2-(f), relettered as 17.3.5.2-(g), unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.3.2, page 227, as follows:
[Division I only]

"17.3.5.3.2 Additional Division I Options. Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests:

[17.3.5.3.2-(a) through 17.3.5.3.2-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) *Tip-Off Classic The Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game*"

Source: Boston College, University of Connecticut, Georgetown University, Georgia Institute of Technology, University of Hartford, College of the Holy Cross, University of Pittsburgh, Providence College, Seton Hall University and Villanova University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: During the 1991 Convention, the Presidents Commission recommended that annual exemptions to the basketball schedule be changed to a once-in-four-year exemption. In doing so, the Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game was swept up with the change. This amendment restores the Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game to its original annual exempt status. This is a single event, nonprofit game, which has been exempt since 1979 and all proceeds go directly to support the Basketball Hall of Fame. Since this event involves only two teams annually, it makes sense to treat it in the same manner as similar events that involve only one contest (i.e., USA Basketball club, foreign team in the United States).

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 102 CONFERENCE EXCEPTION—DIVISION II BASKETBALL

Intent: In Division II basketball, to eliminate the exception related to contests played against conference members located in Alaska, Hawaii or Puerto Rico.

Bylaws: Amend 17.3.5.3.6, page 227, as follows:
[Division II only]

"17.3.5.3.6 Conference Exception. The limitation in 17.3.5.3.5-(a) shall not apply to regular-season contests between two members of the same NCAA member conference."

Source: All members of the California Collegiate Athletic Association.

Legislative Proposals _____

A-117

Effective Date: Immediately

Rationale: Under the current interpretation, it is possible to have mainland teams within the same conference play games in Alaska, Hawaii or Puerto Rico and not have to count them in the permissible number of contests. The sponsors feel that this loophole in the legislation provides unfair scheduling and recruiting advantages.

Action: Adopted by Division II.

**NO. 103 FIRST CONTEST DATE — CROSS COUNTRY,
FIELD HOCKEY AND WATER POLO**

Intent: To establish the first Saturday in September as the first permissible contest date in Divisions I and II in the sports of cross country and field hockey and in all divisions in the sport of water polo.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.4.3.1, page 230, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.4.3.1 Traditional Segment

"(a) Divisions I and II — *September 7 The first Saturday in September.*"

[Remainder of 17.4.3.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.6.3.1, page 237, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.6.3.1 Traditional Segment

"(a) Divisions I and II — *September 7 The first Saturday in September.*"

[Remainder of 17.6.3.1 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.20.2.2.1, page 303, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.20.2.2.1 Traditional Segment. *September 7 The first Saturday in September.*"

Source: Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, Clarion University of Pennsylvania, East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania, Millersville University of Pennsylvania, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania and West Chester University of Pennsylvania.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993

Rationale: The purpose of this legislation is to permit competition during the first weekend in September in the sports of cross country, field hockey and water polo. The opening date of the season would change with the calendar but never would be earlier than September 1 or later than September 7. Other NCAA sports with traditional fall seasons (e.g., football, women's volleyball and soccer) already have legislation permitting that or an earlier starting date. This legislation brings some consistency to the starting date for competition in the traditional fall season

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II; Part C adopted by Division III (154-39, 51 abstentions).

**NO. 104 MAXIMUM DATES OF COMPETITION—
DIVISIONS I AND II CROSS COUNTRY**

Intent: To specify that a Division I or II institution that sponsors men's or women's cross country but does not sponsor indoor or outdoor track and field shall limit its total cross country playing season to seven dates of competition during the traditional segment and five dates during the nontraditional segment.

Bylaws: Amend 17.4.5, pages 230-231, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.4.5 Number of Dates of Competition

"17.4.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of cross country during the institution's cross country playing season to the following number of dates of competition (games and scrimmages), except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.4.5.3:

[17.4.5.1-(a) and 17.4.5.1-(b) unchanged.]

"17.4.5.1.1 Exception — Cross Country Without Indoor or Outdoor Track and Field. A Division I or Division II institution that sponsors men's or women's cross country but does not sponsor indoor or outdoor track and field shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition during the cross country playing season to seven dates of competition during the traditional segment and five dates of competition during the nontraditional segment.

[17.4.5.1.1, renumbered as 17.4.5.1.2, unchanged.]

"17.4.5.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in the following number of cross country dates of competition (this limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

[17.4.5.2-(a) and 17.4.5.2-(b) unchanged.]

"17.4.5.2.1 Exception — Cross Country Without Indoor or Outdoor Track and Field. An individual student-athlete who attends a Division I or Division II member institution that sponsors men's or women's cross country but does not sponsor indoor or outdoor track and field may participate during each academic year in seven dates of competition during the traditional segment in cross country and five dates of competition during the nontraditional segment."

[Remainder of 17.4.5 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the West Coast Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Due to the magnitude of recent restructuring legislation, some details still require fine tuning. Currently, those institutions that sponsor the sport of cross country, but do not sponsor indoor or outdoor track and field, are limited to seven dates of competition in the traditional segment but are permitted no competition in the nontraditional segment. Therefore, student-athletes with an interest in distance running competition are not permitted to compete while representing their institutions during the nontraditional segment, as is the case in other sports. Currently, those institutions cannot meet the competitive needs of their students. This proposal establishes the same guidelines and opportunities for a nontraditional season in the sport of cross country. This is consistent with the guidelines and opportunities in other sports.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 105 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS—DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: To exempt participation in a Division I-AA conference-sponsored postseason tournament from the maximum number of football contests.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.5.2, pages 244-245, as follows:
[Division I-AA football only]

"17.7.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of football contests shall exclude the following:

[17.7.5.2-(a) through 17.7.5.2-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) **Division I-AA Conference Tournament. In Division I-AA, a conference-sponsored postseason tournament (i.e., one between teams that are not identified until the end of the preceding regular season nor selected until after teams for the Division I-AA Football Championship have been named), not to exceed one contest for any member institution;**"

[17.7.5.2-(e) through 17.7.5.2-(m) relettered as 17.7.5.2-(f) through 17.7.5.2-(n), unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group, Bucknell University, Colgate University, Fordham University, College of the Holy Cross, Illinois State University, Lafayette College and Lehigh University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Some members of Division I-AA football are restricted from NCAA postseason participation by conference policy, while other members of Division I-AA, primarily those who sponsor nonscholarship football programs, are faced with the reality that their level of competition essentially rules them out of NCAA postseason consideration. These institutions, therefore, desire the opportunity to participate in a postseason conference-sponsored championship (not to exceed one contest) without includ-

ing that contest in the maximum number of permissible football contests. Such a contest would be the only postseason opportunity for that institution's football team

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA

NO. 106 SPRING FOOTBALL — DIVISION II

Intent: To specify that a Division II student-athlete's participation in countable athletically related activities during the spring football practice period shall be limited to four hours per day and 20 hours per week.

Bylaws: Amend 17.7.6, page 246, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football is prohibited, except for the following:

[17.7.6-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) **Spring Practice — Division II. In Division II, 15 postseason practice sessions are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 21 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar and days during which the institution is closed due to inclement weather, with no practices permitted on Sundays. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 10 of the 15 sessions may involve contact. A student-athlete's participation in countable athletically related activities (see 17.02.1.1) during the spring practice period shall be limited to a maximum of four hours per day and 20 hours per week.**"

[Remainder of 17.7.6 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will clarify that, in Division II, the daily and weekly hour limitations are applicable during the spring football practice period. Similar limitations are applicable in Divisions I-A and I-AA and are consistent with the reform legislation limiting the time student-athletes are required to participate in athletically related activities.

Action: Adopted by Division II.

NO. 107 GOLF PRACTICE ROUND—TIME LIMITS

Intent: To specify that golf practice rounds conducted on the day prior to the start of a collegiate golf tournament and at the tournament site shall count as three hours, regardless of the actual duration of the round.

Bylaws. Amend 17.1.5.1.1, page 209, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.1.5.1.1 Golf Practice-Round Exception. A practice round of golf may exceed the four-hour-per-day limitation, but the weekly limit of 20 hours shall remain in effect. **A practice round**

played on the day prior to the start of a collegiate golf tournament at the tournament site shall count as three hours, regardless of the actual duration of the round."

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: In most cases, practice rounds held prior to a tournament are scheduled around tee times for normal daily play by area residents. Tournament participants find themselves delayed during their practice rounds by normal golf course play or weather. These conflicts are uncontrollable. Presently, it is difficult to determine the amount of time to hold in reserve from the 20-hour-a-week limitation to allow adequate time for practice rounds prior to tournament play. The three-hour computation is consistent with the limit that is applicable to all activities on the day of competition. No additional classes are missed, and there would be no additional cost to the institution.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 108 GOLF—COLLEGE-AM TOURNAMENTS

Intent: To permit tournaments that involve "college-am" events to exceed three days, and to permit college-am tournaments to be conducted separately from other competition and remain excluded from the maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of golf.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.8.4.1, pages 249-250, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.8.4.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of golf during the permissible golf playing season to the following number of dates of competition, except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.8.4.2:

[17.8.4.1-(a) through 17.8.4.1-(c) unchanged.]

"17.8.4.1.1 Tournament Limitations. No tournament (including except those involving 'college-am' fund-raisers) shall exceed three days."

[Remainder of 17.8.4.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.8.4.2, pages 250-252, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.8.4.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of golf shall exclude the following.

[17.8.4.2-(a) through 17.8.4.2-(n) unchanged.]

"(o) College-Am Event. A 'college-am' golf tournament, provided the event is held in conjunction with intercollegiate competition and student-athletes do not receive awards or prizes for such participation."

Source: All members of the Southwest Conference. Memphis State University, New Mexico State University and Wake Forest University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: In a time of budget reductions, college-ams permit programs to raise money and to foster community support for an institution's golf program. In the past, college-ams have not required students to miss additional class time and have been considered as a practice round preceding tournaments. They are not counted as one of the 24 dates of competition for golf and should not be counted as a tournament day, provided students do not receive awards or prizes for participating in the event.

Action: Part A defeated by Division I (129-153, nine abstentions); motion to reconsider defeated. Not moved in Division II. Part B withdrawn.

NO. 109 MAXIMUM DATES OF COMPETITION—GYMNASTICS

Intent: To permit Division II institutions to participate in 13 dates of competition in the sport of gymnastics.

Bylaws. Amend 17.9.4.1, pages 254-255, as follows:

[Division II only]

"17.9.4.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of gymnastics during the permissible gymnastics playing season to 13 dates of competition in Divisions I, II and III or 12 dates in Division II except for the dates of competition excluded under 17.9.4.2.

[17.9.4.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.9.4.1.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 13 dates of competition in gymnastics in Divisions I, II and III and 12 dates in Division II. This limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee); all members of the Pacific West Conference and Texas Woman's University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will provide for the same number of permissible dates of competition in Division II gymnastics that exist currently in Divisions I and III.

Action: Adopted by Division II.

NO. 110 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS—DIVISION I ICE HOCKEY

Intent: To permit Division I institutions to exempt annually from the maximum number of ice hockey contests one game against the U.S. Olympic hockey team.

Bylaws: Amend 17.10.5.3, pages 258-259, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.10.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of ice hockey contests shall exclude the following:

[17.10.5 3-(a) through 17.10.5.3-(f) unchanged.]

"(g) U.S. Olympic Team. One ice hockey contest each year against the U.S. Olympic ice hockey team during that team's training for participation in the Winter Olympics;"

[17.10.5.3-(g) through 17.10.5 3-(m), relettered as 17.10.5.3-(h) through 17.10.5.3-(n), unchanged.]

Source: University of Alaska Anchorage; Colorado College; University of Denver; Michigan Technological University; University of Minnesota, Duluth; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; University of North Dakota; Northern Michigan University; St. Cloud State University, and University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The sponsors would like to make it possible for Team U.S.A. to participate in ice hockey contests against as many Division I institutions as possible.

Action: Adopted by Division I

NO. 111 MAXIMUM DATES OF COMPETITION—SKIING

Intent: To permit Division II institutions to participate in 16 dates of competition in the sport of skiing.

Bylaws: Amend 17.13.4.1, page 269, as follows:
[Division II only]

"17.13.4.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of skiing during the permissible skiing playing season to the following numbers of dates of competition, except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.13.4.2:

"(a) Divisions I, II and III — 16.

"(b) Division II — 14.

[17.13.4.1.1 and 17.13.4.1.2 unchanged.]

"17.13.4.1.3 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 16 dates of competition in skiing in Divisions I, II and III and not more than 14 dates in Division II. This limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale. This proposal will provide for the same number of permissible dates of competition in Division II skiing that exist currently in Divisions I and III.

Action: Adopted by Division II.

NO. 112 PRESEASON SOCCER SCRIMMAGES—DIVISION II

Intent: To permit Division II institutions to play up to three soccer

scrimmages or exhibition games prior to the institutions' first scheduled contests.

Bylaws: Amend 17.14.5.1.1 and 17.14.5.1 2, page 273, as follows:

[Division II only]

"17.14.5.1.1 Scrimmages/Exhibition Games — Divisions I, II and III. A Division I, II or III member institution may play up to three soccer scrimmages or exhibition games (which shall not count toward the institution's won-lost record) prior to the first scheduled contest during a particular academic year, provided such scrimmages or exhibition games are conducted during the institution's declared playing season per 17.14.1 and are counted against the maximum number of contests.

"17.14.5.1.2 Scrimmages/Exhibition Games — Division II. A Division II member institution may play up to three soccer scrimmages or exhibition games (which shall not count toward the institution's won-lost record) during the institution's declared playing season per 17.14.1, provided such scrimmages or exhibition games are not conducted prior to the first permissible contest per 17.14.2 and are counted against the maximum number of contests."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee); all members of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference, Colorado School of Mines, Gannon University and Seattle Pacific University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: This legislation would make the Division II rule consistent with the rule in Divisions I and III. Currently, Division II only permits scrimmages after the first contest. The purpose of a scrimmage should be to prepare for the regular season; therefore, it should be permissible to conduct such scrimmages prior to the first contest.

Action: Adopted by Division II

NO. 113 DATES OF COMPETITION—INDOOR AND OUTDOOR TRACK

Intent: To permit an institution that uses both indoor and outdoor track to meet divisional sports sponsorship requirements to count a maximum of six two-day meets as one date of competition each.

Bylaws: Amend 17.18.5, pages 294-296, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.18.5 Number of Dates of Competition

"17.18.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of indoor/or outdoor track during the permissible indoor/or outdoor track playing season to 18 dates of competition except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.18.5.2. A member institution that sponsors indoor and outdoor track and participates in at least the minimum number of contests with at least the minimum number of participants required to count both sports in meeting divisional membership

requirements shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in indoor/outdoor track during the permissible indoor/outdoor track playing season to 18 dates of competition, which may include not more than six (6) two-day meets that shall each count as a single date. These limitations do not include those dates of competition excluded under 17.18.5.2.

[17.18.5.1.1 unchanged.]

17.18.5.1.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 18 dates of competition in indoor/ or outdoor track. **An individual student-athlete competing in indoor and outdoor track at a member institution that uses both indoor and outdoor track to meet divisional sports sponsorship requirements may participate in each academic year in not more than 18 dates of competition which may include not more than six (6) two-day meets that shall each count as a single date.** *This* These limitations includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution."

[Remainder of 17.18.5 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: At the 1992 Convention, the membership approved legislation sponsored by the NCAA Council that recognized the need for an expanded playing season for institutions sponsoring indoor and outdoor track. This amendment seeks similar consideration regarding contest limitations in those sports. Currently, the same contest limits apply to institutions sponsoring either indoor or outdoor track and to institutions sponsoring both indoor and outdoor track. This amendment will allow an institution using both indoor and outdoor track to meet sports sponsorship requirements to compete in a maximum of six two-day meets that each will count as one date of competition. Similar counting of multiday events currently exists in skiing (17.13.4.1.1) and tennis (17.17.5.1.2 and 17.17.5.1.4).

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 114 WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL—PRESEASON ALUMNI MATCH

Intent: In Divisions I and II, to permit a women's volleyball match with alumni to be played on the weekend prior to September 1 when September 1 does not fall on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday.

Bylaws: Amend 17.19.3.1, page 298, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.19.3.1 Traditional Segment

"(a) Divisions I and II — September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday, **except that an alumni match may be played the weekend prior to September 1 when September 1 does not fall on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday.**"

[Remainder of 17.19.3.1 unchanged.]

Source: Brigham Young University; University of Florida; Illinois State University; University of New Haven; New Mexico State University; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and Washington State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Due to calendar restrictions, an institution will not be able to engage in any outside competition on the weekend prior to September 1 during the next three years. This proposal will allow an institution's women's volleyball team to use the weekend prior to September 1 for alumni activities. These activities have proven to be a valuable source of promotion and support for the institution.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

Recruiting

NO. 115 LOCAL SPORTS CLUB

Intent: To preclude a member of an institution's men's or women's basketball coaching staff from participating in coaching activities in the sport of basketball for a local sports club or organization.

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.2.4, page 111, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.12.2.4 Local Sports Clubs. **In sports other than Divisions I and II basketball,** An institution's coach may be involved as a participant or in instructional or coaching activities in the same sport for a local sports club or organization located in the institution's home community, provided all prospects participating in said activities are legal residents of the area (within a 50-mile radius of the institution). Further, it is not permissible for the institution's coach to assign a prospect who lives outside the 50-mile area to another coach of the club."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Under current legislation, a coach in any sport may be involved as a coach for a local sports club or organization located in the institution's home community, provided all prospects participating as members of the team are legal residents of the area (within a 50-mile radius of the institution). In the sport of basketball, such a rule could provide a significant recruiting advantage, particularly to institutions located in heavily-populated areas. The elimination of the local sports club exception in the sport of basketball in Divisions I and II will promote equity in the recruiting

process and is consistent with current legislation prohibiting basketball coaches from being involved with AAU basketball teams.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II, motion to reconsider in Division II defeated.

NO. 116 RECRUITING—TELEPHONE CALLS

Intent: To permit unlimited telephone calls to a prospect from any location on the day of a permissible, in-person, off-campus recruiting visit.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.4-(b)-(6), page 87, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(6) Off-Campus Contact Exception. Institutional staff members may make unlimited telephone calls to a prospective student-athlete *from the prospect's home community* on the day a permissible, in-person, off-campus contact occurs."

Source: All members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current rule allows unlimited telephone calls to a prospect on the day of a home visit only when the coach arrives in the prospect's home community. However, the necessity for the calls often occurs earlier in the day when transportation difficulties cause a delay in the coach's arrival in the home community. These calls should be exempted from the one-call-per-week rule in the same manner as those when the coach arrives in the home community.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I and II.

NO. 117 RECRUITING—TELEPHONE CALLS

Intent: In Division I-A football, to preclude telephone contact with a prospective student-athlete prior to August 15 following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school; to limit telephone contact to once per week from August 15 through November 30; to permit telephone contacts with a prospective student-athlete at the institution's discretion between December 1 and February 15, and to limit additional telephone contact from February 16 through August 14 of the prospect's senior year to once per week.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.4, pages 86-87, as follows

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"13.1.2.4 General Restrictions: Staff Members and Governing Board. The following are additional restrictions that apply to an institution's staff members and governing board:

[13.1.2.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Telephone Contact. In Divisions I and II **sports other than Division I-A football**, staff members shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) prior to July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school; thereafter, staff members shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) more than once per week but may accept collect

calls from the prospect. **In Division I-A football, staff members shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) prior to August 15 following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school. Thereafter, from August 15 through November 30, telephone contact with a prospective student-athlete is limited to once per week. From December 1 through February 15, telephone contact may be made with a senior prospective student-athlete at the institution's discretion. From February 16 through August 14, Division I-A football staff members shall not telephone a senior prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) more than once per week. In all sports, staff members in Divisions I and II shall not telephone a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) during the conduct of any of the institution's intercollegiate athletics contests in that sport.**

"(1) Two-Year College Nonqualifier Exception. For a prospective student-athlete attending a two-year college who was not a qualifier, telephone contact is prohibited prior to August 15 following the prospect's completion of the first year of collegiate enrollment."

[Remainder of 13.1.2.4 unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; University of Florida; Florida State University; University of Kansas; Memphis State University; Ohio State University; University of Oklahoma; University of Pittsburgh; Texas A&M University; Texas Tech University; Utah State University, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to adjust the periods during which an institution's football staff members may call a prospective student-athlete. By allowing only one call per week throughout the football season and from February 16 through August 15, there will be nine months in a calendar year that will have limited phone calls. From December 1 through February 15, there are two dead periods, (1) from December 24 through January 1, and (2) from the day of registration for the annual convention of the American Football Coaches Association until 12:01 a.m. on the day after the completion of the convention, which leaves less than eight weeks of recruiting before the National Letter of Intent signing date. There are many instances that require more than one call per week during the recruiting process. It is a time for dispensing of information pertaining to the university's academic and athletics programs and for arranging official visits to the institution. This amendment would reduce the costs spent on contacting high-school coaches while trying to relay information from the institution to the prospective student-athlete. Also, under the current rule, the media and recruiting services enjoy more access to prospects than institutional staff members.

Action: Adopted by Divisions I-A and I-AA.

NO. 118 CONTACTS—DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: To permit one contact per week at the prospect's educational institution and not more than three contacts at other sites in Divisions I-A and I-AA football.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.4.2, page 94, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]
"13.1.4.2 Visits During Contact Period — Divisions I-A and I-AA Football. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, **one contact per prospect is permitted at the prospect's educational institution during each week of the contact period, and institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of prospects enrolled in the institution** *institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than three days during the football contact period*"

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.1 5, page 95, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]
"13.1.5 Permissible Number of Contacts. **In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, one contact per prospect is permitted at the prospect's educational institution during each week of the contact period and three contacts are permitted at other sites. During a contact period, institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of prospects enrolled in the institution. In all other sports, each institution shall be limited to three in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect at any site (which shall include contacts made with the prospect's relatives or legal guardians but shall not include contacts made during an official visit per 13.7).**"
[Remainder of 13.1.5 unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Auburn University; Brigham Young University; East Carolina University; University of Florida; University of Kentucky; Ohio State University; Syracuse University; Texas A&M University; Texas Tech University; Utah State University, and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This amendment permits an institution's Division I-A football staff adequate opportunities during the recruiting process to personally assimilate information on the character of a prospective student-athlete. It is important to remember that in recent years, off-campus recruiting in football has been reduced drastically.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A (48-62) and Division I-AA (paddles).

NO. 119 RECRUITING—CONTACTS

Intent: To permit institutions that do not subscribe to the National

Letter of Intent to utilize the same contact rules subsequent to the prospect's signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid as those institutions that subscribe to the National Letter of Intent.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.5.3, page 95, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.1.5.3 Contacts Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing. Subsequent to the calendar day on which the prospect signs a National Letter of Intent **or, for institutions not subscribing to the National Letter of Intent, the calendar day of the prospect's signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid**, there shall be no limit on the number of contacts with the prospect, the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) by the institution with which the prospect has signed; however, the following conditions continue to apply:"

[Remainder of 13.1.5.3 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: For institutions not subscribing to the National Letter of Intent, this amendment will permit the same contact with prospects who have committed, through the written acceptance of an institution's offer of admission and/or financial aid, as currently is permitted with prospects who have signed National Letters of Intent.

Action: Adopted by Division I (162-141, four abstentions) and Division II (paddles).

NO. 120 EVALUATIONS—DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: To eliminate the May evaluation period in Divisions I-A and I-AA football.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.7.3.3, page 97, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"13.1.7.3.3 Limitations on the Number of May Evaluations — Football. In the sport of football, *institutional staff members shall not visit a prospect's educational institution on more than one calendar day during the May evaluation period.*"

B. Bylaws: Amend 30.10.5, pages 390-391, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"30.10.5 Football, Division I. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to football in Division I:

[30.10.5-(a) through 30.10.5-(e) unchanged.]

"(f) The Tuesday following the initial date for the signing of the National Letter of Intent through **April 30 May 31:**

Quiet Period

"(g) *Fifteen consecutive days (excluding Sundays) during May 1 through May 31 selected at the discre-*

Evaluation Period"

tion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics.

[30.10.5-(h) deleted.]

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The elimination of the May evaluation period in football will help contain recruiting costs.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 121 EVALUATIONS—DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL

Intent: In Division I-A football, to specify that the time period during which the four permissible evaluations occur shall be from May 1 through November 30 of the following academic year.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.7.3.1, page 96, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"13.1.7.3.1 Time Period for Counting Football Evaluations — Division I-A. In the sport of football in Division I-A, the time period during which the four permissible evaluations may take place shall be from May 1 through April 30 November 30 of the following academic year."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; East Carolina University; University of Florida; Florida State University; Louisiana State University; Memphis State University; Ohio State University; University of Pittsburgh; Syracuse University; University of Texas at Austin; Texas A&M University; Utah State University, and West Virginia University.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: A shortened time frame to evaluate prospective student-athletes will be easier to understand and enforce

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 122 EVALUATIONS—DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: To make the time period for counting football evaluations in Division I-AA consistent with the time period for counting football evaluations in Division I-A (i.e., May 1 through April 30)

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.7.3.2, pages 96-97, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"13.1.7.3.2 Time Period for Counting Football Evaluations — Division I-AA. In the sport of football in Division I-AA, the time period during which the four permissible evaluations may take place shall be from May 1 of the prospect's junior year in high school through the following academic year or until the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent, whichever occurs earlier April 30 of the following academic year."

Source: All members of the Big Sky Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately

Rationale: At the 1992 Convention, upon reconsideration, Proposal

No. 134 as amended by Proposal No. 134-1 was adopted in Division I-AA. In Division I-AA, because of erroneous information provided to the delegates that Proposal No. 134-1 previously had been adopted by Division I-AA, the delegates reconsidered and passed Proposal No. 134. When the error was discovered, the delegates were advised by the chair to allow the vote to stand on Proposal No. 134 and to amend it to reflect the language of Proposal No. 134-1 at the 1993 Convention with an immediate effective date.

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA.

NO. 123 INSTITUTIONAL STATIONERY

Intent: To eliminate the limitations on institutional stationery.

Bylaws: Amend 13.4.1, pages 98-100, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Permissible Items. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the following printed materials to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved:

[13.4.1-(a) through 13.4.1-(l) unchanged.]

"(m) Stationery In Division I only, athletics department stationery is limited to two colors of printing on the stationery (not including the color of the typing or writing on such stationery) Such stationery may include the name, address, telephone number(s) of athletics department staff members and a single university logo, but photographs of enrolled student-athletes or any other promotional material is prohibited

"(1) Color of Typing or Writing on Stationery An institution may utilize a different color of typing or writing than the two colors of print on the stationery

"(2) Embossed Stationery An institution may use embossed stationery, provided the institution complies with the two-colors-of-print restriction set forth in 13.4.1-(m).

"(3) Foil Printing An institution may utilize foil printing on its institutional stationery in conjunction with other printing provided the foil counts as one of the two permissible colors of print.

"(4) Multicolor Effects, Graphics. An institution may not use electronic equipment (e.g., printers, copiers) to produce additional colors beyond two on any part of the stationery (including multicolor type) and may not use graphics to enhance the stationery.

"(5) Team Accomplishments An institution is permitted to highlight a specific team's accomplishments (e.g., national championships, conference championships, bowl games) on its stationery.

"(6) University Logo, Use of An institution may use more than one university logo (e.g., one for football, one for basketball), provided not more than one logo appears on any one piece of stationery. The stationery may not include a university logo and a conference logo."

[13.4.1-(n) and 13.4.1-(o), relettered as 13.4.1-(m) and 13.4.1-(n), and 13.4.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale. Although originally intended to contain and reduce costs, this legislation has produced interpretive minutiae (e.g., it does not allow an institution to use its less expensive, campus-wide stationery if it contains watermarks or two logos) and runs counter to cost effectiveness in this area.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 124 MEDIA GUIDES/RECRUITING BROCHURES

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

Intent: To eliminate media guides and/or recruiting brochures as permissible recruiting materials while retaining the color restrictions on such publications.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.4.1, pages 98-100, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Permissible Items. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the following printed materials to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved:

[13.4.1-(a) through 13.4.1-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) *Publications (Athletics).* In addition to game programs, an institution may produce either a recruiting brochure or media guide (but not both) in each sport it sponsors and provide it to a prospect. The publication may have only one color of printing inside the covers

"(1) *Nonrecruiting Publications.* An institution may produce additional athletics publications (other than an additional media guide or recruiting brochure) unrelated to the recruitment of prospective student-athletes.

"(2) *Additional Media Publications.* An institution may produce additional media publications (e.g., postseason media guide, preseason prospectus, spring football practice guide), provided the additional publications are not provided to prospects."

[13.4.1-(j) through 13.4.1-(o), relettered as 13.4.1-(i) through 13.4.1-(n), and 13.4.1 l unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.4.2, page 100, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.4.2 Divisions I and II — Nonpermissible Items. A Division I or II institution may not provide the following materials to prospects or to coaches of prospects:

"(c) *Publications (Athletics).* In addition to game programs, an institution may produce either a recruiting brochure or media guide (but not both) in each sport it sponsors. The publication may have only one color of printing inside the covers and may not be provided to prospects.

"(1) *Nonrecruiting Publications.* An institution may produce additional athletics publications (other than an additional media guide or recruiting brochure) unrelated to the recruitment of prospective student-athletes.

"(2) *Additional Media Publications.* An institution may produce additional media publications (e.g., postseason media guide, preseason prospectus, spring football practice guide), provided the additional guides are not provided to prospects."

[13.4.2-(c) through 13.4.2-(g), relettered as 13.4.2-(d) through 13.4.2-(h), unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993; the prohibition shall apply to media guides covering the 1993-94 academic year and thereafter.

Rationale: This proposal will significantly reduce costs for recruiting publications purposes. The current rule has resulted in a combined recruiting/media guide that has increased printing and mailing costs while providing marginal recruiting or media benefits. However, the proposal retains the restrictions that an institution may produce a media guide or a recruiting brochure, but not both, and that only one color of printing may be utilized inside the covers.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 125 OFFICIAL VISIT—ACADEMIC TRANSCRIPT

Intent: To require member institutions to obtain a prospect's high-school (or college) academic transcript (which may be an unofficial photocopy of an official document) prior to providing the prospect with an expense-paid visit.

Bylaws: Amend 13.7.1.2.3, page 103, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.7.1.2.3 *Academic Transcript and PSAT, SAT, PACT Plus or ACT Score — Official Visit.* A Division I or II member institution may not provide an expense-paid visit to a prospective student-athlete who has not presented the institution with a **high-school (or college) academic transcript** and a score from a PSAT, an SAT, a PACT Plus or an ACT test taken on a national testing date under national testing conditions. **The academic transcript may be an unofficial photocopy of an official document from the prospective student-athlete's high school (or collegiate institution).** The score must be presented in writing through an official high-school or testing agency document but does not have to be received directly from the testing agency. A foreign or learning-disabled prospective student-athlete who requires a special administration of the PSAT, SAT, PACT Plus or ACT may present such a score upon the approval of the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee or the Council Subcommittee on Initial-Eligibility Waivers."

Source: Boston College, University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, University of Pittsburgh, Providence College, Seton

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: This proposal will ensure the availability of a prospective student-athlete's transcript for evaluation purposes prior to the expense of an official visit. It also will require the institution to have two-year and four-year college prospects' transcripts for evaluation prior to an official visit. To be able to evaluate such a document on campus prior to a paid visit could avoid embarrassment and cut costs.

Action: Adopted by Division I; defeated by Division II.

NO. 126 OFFICIAL VISIT PRIOR TO EARLY SIGNING PERIOD

Intent: To permit an official visit prior to the early signing period for prospects who have presented at least a 70 score on the PSAT or a 17 on the PACT Plus.

Bylaws: Amend 13.7.1.2.4, pages 103-104, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.7.1.2.4 Academic Credentials for Official Visit Prior to Early Signing Period. A Division I member institution may not provide an expense-paid visit to a prospective student-athlete in a sport that has an early signing period for the National Letter of Intent prior to the initial early signing date in that sport if the prospect has not presented the institution with a minimum combined SAT score of 700 or PSAT score of 70 or a minimum composite ACT or PACT Plus score of 17, and also has presented a minimum 2.000 grade-point average in at least seven core courses (per 14.3.1.1.1). A prospective student-athlete in the applicable sports who does not present these academic credentials shall not begin an official visit until 24 hours after the last day of the early signing period in that sport."

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: On the advice of secondary school counselors and college admissions officers, many student-athletes do not take the SAT or ACT until the fall of their senior year, after the early National Letter of Intent signing dates. Including the PSAT and the PACT Plus, ordinarily taken in the junior year, would avoid interfering with the normal academic testing schedule of many students while still assuring that only prospective student-athletes with a demonstrated likelihood of being qualifiers will be able to take "early" official visits. [Note: A PSAT score of 70 approximates an SAT score of 700.]

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 127 SUMMER BASKETBALL CAMP CERTIFICATION — DIVISION I

Intent: To specify that coaching staff members in the sport of Division I basketball may attend only institutional camps per Bylaw

13.13.1.1 and noninstitutional summer basketball camps that are certified by the NCAA.

A. Bylaws. Amend 13.13 by adding new 13.13.5, page 116, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.13.5 Division I Coaches' Attendance at Summer Basketball Camps. A member of an institution's basketball coaching staff may attend only institutional summer basketball camps per Bylaw 13.13.1.1 and noninstitutional camps that are certified per Bylaw 30.15."

B. Bylaws. Amend 30 by adding new 30.15, page 395, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"30.15 SUMMER BASKETBALL CAMP CERTIFICATION

"In order for a summer basketball camp to be certified, a certification application form must be submitted each year to the NCAA national office not later than April 1. A camp review form for each camp also must be submitted to the NCAA national office not later than October 1 subsequent to the camp sessions. The following criteria must be met by each camp in order to be certified:

"(a) No Division I campuses may be utilized for noninstitutional basketball camps;

"(b) No admissions fees may be charged to college coaches;

"(c) No fees may be charged to receive a camp roster; further, the roster must include the name, height, year in school, high school, city, state and camp location for every camp participant;

"(d) Admissions fees charged to all camp participants must be similar;

"(e) Noninstitutional camps shall not employ any Division I coaches, Division I student-athletes or relatives of prospective student-athletes. Such a camp shall not employ an AAU or a high-school coach of any prospect who has completed his or her junior year of high school and is attending the camp;

"(f) No air or ground transportation or other gifts or inducements shall be provided to the campers or their coaches or relatives;

"(g) A prospective student-athlete who attends an NCAA certified camp shall not retain any athletics equipment provided for his or her use at the camp other than a camp T-shirt;

"(h) Compensation provided to camp personnel shall be commensurate with the going rate for camp personnel of like teaching ability and camp experience;

"(i) All noninstitutional camps shall provide a personal growth program for a minimum of one hour per day. The program should provide information on any or

all of the following: (1) substance abuse; (2) AIDS; (3) SAT/ACT preparation; (4) NCAA recruiting rules; (5) NCAA academic requirements; (6) career opportunities, and (7) conditioning/nutrition information. The camps also shall provide skill instruction as part of the camps' daily activities;

- "(j) A certified athletics trainer shall be present at every camp, and only high-school or college certified officials shall be used in all scrimmages; further, the camp shall establish a developmental program for referees and athletics trainers;
- "(k) Camp personnel shall not influence or recruit prospective student-athletes for any NCAA member institution; further, camp personnel shall not wear any apparel bearing an institution's name during the camp;
- "(l) The passing of notes between NCAA coaches and campers at any location at the camp is prohibited;
- "(m) Separate seating must be provided for parents and coaches;
- "(n) Media interviews with camp participants must be regulated and coordinated;
- "(o) Not greater than a 10:1 camper/staff ratio must exist;
- "(p) No individual recognition may be established (e.g., all-star team, slam-dunk contest), and
- "(q) Alcohol shall be prohibited at all camp sites."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee)

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal is a result of the adoption of Proposal No. 141-1 at the 1992 Convention. The NCAA Recruiting Committee has worked with the National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC) and the Women's Basketball Coaches Association (WBCA) to develop criteria for the establishment of NCAA-sponsored summer basketball camps. This proposal will eliminate basketball camps that have become "show places" for prospective student-athletes and advisors to parade their basketball talents in a manner that seems inconsistent with and inappropriate for collegiate athletics. The proposal also will provide minimum certification criteria that must be met by a noninstitutional camp in order for coaches to attend that camp and will provide member institutions' coaches an opportunity to evaluate prospective student-athletes without the outside pressure associated with independent camps.

Action. Adopted as amended by 127-1 by Division I.

NO. 127-1 SUMMER BASKETBALL CAMP CERTIFICATION — DIVISION I

Intent: To eliminate the specified provisions of the proposed legislation related to the certification of summer basketball camps.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 127-B, 30.15, as follows:

[Division I only]

"30.15 SUMMER BASKETBALL CAMP CERTIFICATION

"In order for a summer basketball camp to be certified, a certification application form must be submitted each year to the NCAA national office not later than April 1. A camp review form for each camp also must be submitted to the NCAA national office not later than October 1 subsequent to the camp sessions. The following criteria must be met by each camp in order to be certified:

- "(a) No Division I campuses may be utilized for noninstitutional basketball camps;
- "(b) No admissions fees may be charged to college coaches.
- "(c) No fees may be charged to receive a camp roster further, the roster must include the name, height, year in school, high school, city, state and camp location for every camp participant;
- "(d) (b) Admissions fees charged to all camp participants must be similar.
- "(e) (c) Noninstitutional camps shall not employ any Division I coaches, Division I student-athletes or relatives of prospective student-athletes. Such a camp shall not employ an AAU or a high-school coach of any prospect who has completed his or her junior year of high school and is attending the camp;
- "(f) (d) No air or ground transportation or other gifts or inducements shall be provided to the campers or their coaches or relatives;
- "(g) (e) A prospective student-athlete who attends an NCAA certified camp shall not retain any athletics equipment provided for his or her use at the camp other than a camp T-shirt, and
- "(h) (f) Compensation provided to camp personnel shall be commensurate with the going rate for camp personnel of like teaching ability and camp experience.
- "(i) All noninstitutional camps shall provide a personal growth program for a minimum of one hour per day. The program should provide information on any or all of the following: (1) substance abuse; (2) AIDS; (3) SAT/ACT preparation; (4) NCAA recruiting rules; (5) NCAA academic requirements; (6) career opportunities, and (7) conditioning/nutrition information. The camps also shall provide skill instruction as part of the camps' daily activities.
- "(j) A certified athletics trainer shall be present at every camp, and only high-school or college certified officials shall be used in all scrimmages; further, the camp shall establish a developmental program for referees and athletics trainers.
- "(k) Camp personnel shall not influence or recruit prospective student-athletes for any NCAA member institution, further, camp personnel shall not wear any apparel bearing an institution's name during the camp;
- "(l) The passing of notes between NCAA coaches and campers at any location at the camp is prohibited.
- "(m) Separate seating must be provided for parents and coaches.
- "(n) Media interviews with camp participants must be regulated and coordinated.
- "(o) Not greater than a 10:1 camper/staff ratio must exist;
- "(p) No individual recognition may be established (e.g., all-star team, slam-dunk contest), and
- "(q) Alcohol shall be prohibited at all camp sites."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee)

Rationale: This proposal addresses concerns that have arisen related to this legislation by making the certification requirements for noninstitutional camps similar to the restrictions imposed on institutional camps. The Council anticipates that additional criteria consistent with legislation applicable to institutional camps may be developed in accordance with the Council's authority to amend Bylaw 30.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 128 EVALUATIONS—DIVISION II WOMEN'S BASKETBALL

Intent: To specify that Division II women's basketball coaches may evaluate prospects during any sanctioned AAU women's competition occurring between May 18 and June 14.

Bylaws: Amend 30.10.4, page 390, as follows:

[Division II only]

"30.10.4 Basketball, Division II Women's. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to women's basketball in Division II:

[30.10.4-(a) through 30.10.4-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) During the **any sanctioned Amateur Athletic Union women's national championship competition occurring between May 18 and June 14:** Evaluation Period"

[Remainder of 30.10.4 unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Huntsville; Augustana College (South Dakota); University of Colorado, Colorado Springs; Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne; Kentucky State University; Mankato State University; Mississippi College; University of Nebraska at Kearney; North Dakota State University; Northern Kentucky University, and Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Division II basketball recruiting efforts, due to limited staff size and cost containment, generally are limited geographically to state and regional areas. Recruitment at the national AAU championship by Division II institutions is very limited. This legislation would permit Division II programs the opportunity to maximize their resources by viewing a greater number of local prospective student-athletes in a concentrated setting.

Action: Adopted by Division II.

NO. 129 CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS—DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

Intent: To limit the Division I football recruiting period as specified, to limit official visits by prospects to the time period from January 15-March 15 and to prohibit midyear two-year college trans-

fers from participating in spring football during the academic year in which the transfer occurs.

A. Bylaws: Amend 30.10.5, pages 390-391, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"30.10.5 Football, Division I. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to football in Division I:

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| "(a) June 1 through October 31
[except for (1) below] November 30:
"(1) Fridays during the months of October" | Quiet Period |
| "(b) November 1 through November 30. | Evaluation Period |
| "(c) (b) December 1 through December 23
December 15: | Evaluation Period |
| "(c) December 16 through December 23: | Contact Period |
| "(d) December 24 through January 1: | Evaluation Period |
| "(e) January 2 through the Monday following the initial date for the signing of the National Letter of Intent January 14 [except for (1) and (2) below]:
"(1) 12:01 a.m. on the day of registration of the annual convention of the American Football Coaches Association to 12:01 a.m. on the day after completion of the convention: | Quiet Period |
| "(f) January 15 through March 15, except for (1) below:
"(2) (1) During the period 48 hours before and 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the date for signing the National Letter of Intent (the National Letter of Intent cannot be hand-delivered during this time; it must be mailed): | Dead Period |
| "(f) The Tuesday following the initial date for the signing of the National Letter of Intent through April 30 | Contact Period |
| "(g) Fifteen consecutive days (excluding Sundays) during May 1 through May 31 selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics | Dead Period |
| "(h) Those days in May not designated in (g) above for evaluation opportunities: | Quiet Period |
| "(g) March 16 through May 31, except for (f)-(1) above: | Quiet Period |

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.1 2.2, page 103, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"13.7 1.2.2 First Opportunity to Visit and Time When Visits are Permitted. A prospect may not be provided a visit earlier than the opening day of classes of the prospect's senior year in high school. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, the visit may occur only during the time period between January 15 and March 15."

- C. **Bylaws:** Amend 14.6.4 by adding new 14.6.4.5, page 152, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"14.6.4.5 Participation in Spring Football Practice by a Two-Year College Transfer. In Division I, a midyear transfer student from a two-year college shall not be permitted to participate in spring football practice during the academic year in which the transfer occurs."

Source: All members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: May 1, 1993.

Rationale: This proposal is intended to provide an effective and efficient recruiting calendar in Division I football that also drastically slashes costs. It confines the evaluation period to the first 15 days in December and the contact period to a two-month period ending March 15. With a National Letter of Intent signing date of March 16, institutions will have access to the prospect's seven-semester high-school transcript before the signing date, assuring a more complete academic review of the prospect's record. It concludes all off-campus football recruiting by March 15, thus permitting institutions to conduct their spring football practices during late spring without recruiting interruptions.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 130 EVALUATIONS—DIVISIONS I-A AND I-AA FOOTBALL

Intent: In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, to eliminate Memorial Day from counting in the consecutive 15 days of the May evaluation.

Bylaws: Amend 30.10.5-(g), page 391, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"30.10.5 Football, Division I. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to football in Division I:

[30.10.5-(a) through 30.10.5-(f) unchanged.]

"(g) Fifteen consecutive days (excluding Evaluation Period" Sundays and Memorial Day) during May 1 through May 31 selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics:

[Remainder of 30.10.5 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Many northern institutions hold spring football practice in late spring, which has the effect of moving the May evaluation period to the latter half of May. Since most high schools are closed Memorial Day, the effective period of evaluation becomes 14 days. This proposal would remedy that inequity.

Action: Adopted by Division I-A and Division I-AA.

Membership

NO. 131 UNCLASSIFIED FOOTBALL — DIVISION I

Intent: To permit a member of Division I to maintain a football program that is not classified as I-A or I-AA, to permit such an institution to provide its football student-athletes with only need-based financial aid, to prohibit such an institution from voting on I-A or I-AA football legislative issues, to prohibit such an institution from using football to meet sports sponsorship requirements, to prohibit such an institution from conducting spring football practice, and to permit such an institution to employ two head or assistant coaches and six restricted-earnings coaches.

- A. **Bylaws:** Amend 20.1.1.2, page 329, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"20.1.1.2 Divisions I-A and, I-AA and Unclassified Football. In the sport of football, Division I shall be divided into Division I-A and, Division I-AA and unclassified."

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 20.4.1.1, page 335, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"20.4.1.1 Division I Member. A member of Division I may petition to be classified in football in Division I-A or Division I-AA. If the petition is granted, the institution shall be entitled to vote in that division on legislative issues directly affecting football. If a member of Division I does not petition to be classified in Division I-A or Division I-AA, that institution is not permitted to vote on legislative issues directly affecting football."

- C. **Bylaws:** Amend 20.9.3.2 by adding new 20.9.3.2.2, page 342, as follows:

[Division I only]

"20.9.3.2.2 Division I Football. A member of Division I that does not petition to be classified in football in Division I-A or Division I-AA (per 20.4.1.1) is not permitted to use the sport of football to meet sports sponsorship requirements."

- D. **Bylaws:** Amend 20.9 by adding new 20.9.8, page 347, as follows:

[Division I only]

"20.9.8 Division I Football. A member of Division I that is not classified in football in Division I-A or I-AA is not required to meet a scheduling requirement and is not permitted to use the sport of football to meet sports sponsorship requirements."

- E. **Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.5 by adding new 15.5.5.3, page 181, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"15.5.5.3 Division I Football. A member of Division I that does not classify its football program as I-A or I-AA is not

permitted to provide a student-athlete with financial aid based in any degree upon athletics ability."

- F. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.7.6, page 246, as follows:
[Division I only]

"17.7.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football is prohibited, except for the following:

"(a) Spring Practice — Divisions I-A and I-AA. In Divisions I-A and I-AA, 15 postseason practice sessions are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 29 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar and days during which the institution is closed due to inclement weather, with no practices permitted on Sundays. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 10 of the 15 sessions may involve contact. The amount of time that a student-athlete may be involved in such postseason practice activities shall be limited to a maximum of 20 hours per week."

[17.7.6-(b) through 17.7.6-(f) unchanged.]

- G. **Bylaws:** Amend 11.7 by adding new 11.7.4, page 64, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows.

[Division I only]

"11.7.4 Football Other Than I-A/I-AA. There shall be a limit of two head or assistant coaches and six restricted-earnings coaches that may be employed by an institution in the sport of football (other than Division I-A or I-AA football)."

[11.7.4 and 11.7.5, renumbered as 11.7.5 and 11.7.6, unchanged.]

- H. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.3, page 88, as follows:
[Division I only]

"13.1.3 Recruiting Calendars. Recruiting calendars limiting contact and evaluation periods apply in the sports of basketball and football in Divisions I and II. Divisions I and II basketball and in Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football and also include recruiting dead periods in all sports in those divisions. The Council shall have the authority to establish in the Administrative Regulations (per Constitution 5.2.3.1) such calendars for Divisions I and II sports. (See 30.10 for a complete listing of the calendars in effect at the time of the publication of this Manual; see also Figures 13-1 through 13-7 for current 1993-94 calendars.)"

[Remainder of 13.1.3 unchanged.]

Source: Boston College, Davidson College, Franklin and Marshall College, Georgetown University, La Salle University, University of Pittsburgh, Providence College, St. John's University (New York), St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania), Santa Clara University, Syracuse University, Towson State University, Villanova University and West Virginia University.

Effective Date: September 1, 1993.

Rationale: This proposal provides Division I institutions the opportunity to play cost-containment football without adversely affecting any other division. This concept of cost-containment football allows a member of Division I to remain cost conscious while providing significant opportunities to its student-athletes. Since this level of football would not be compatible with I-A or I-AA football, institutions with cost-containment football should not be permitted to count football toward sports sponsorship requirements and should not be permitted to vote on I-A or I-AA football legislative issues.

Action: Parts A and B defeated (common provision requiring majority vote of each division; defeated in Divisions I and II, approved in Division III). Parts C through H moot.

NO. 132 DIVISION I FOOTBALL—DIVISIONAL PLAYDOWN

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

Intent: To permit a member of Division I to be classified in Division II or III in the sport of football and to specify that such an institution not be eligible for the Division II or III football championship.

Bylaws: Amend 20.4 by adding new 20.4.1.1.1, page 335, as follows:
[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"20.4.1.1.1 Football. A member of Division I may petition the Division II or III Steering Committee to be classified in football in Division II or Division III, but if the petition is granted, shall not be eligible for that division's football championship."

Source: Boston College, Davidson College, Franklin & Marshall College, Gallaudet University, Georgetown University, La Salle University, St. John's University (New York), University of Pittsburgh, Providence College, St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania), Santa Clara University, Syracuse University and Villanova University.

Effective Date: September 1, 1993.

Rationale: If a Division I institution maintains seven sports for men and seven sports for women, then the institution has met its sports sponsorship requirements. This proposal will permit a Division I member to offer its students the opportunity to play football without creating enormous financial expenses.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 133 DIVISION I-AA SCHEDULING REQUIREMENTS

Intent: To permit a Division I institution that sponsors a nonscholarship football program in Division I-AA, or which offers fewer than 20 percent of the maximum allowable number of scholarships in Division I-AA and was classified in Division II prior to September 1993, to appeal to the Division I Steering Committee for a waiver of the Division I-AA football scheduling requirements if fewer than six other similar Division I-AA football pro-

grams exist within a 500-mile radius of the institution's campus.

Bylaws: Amend 20.9.7.2, page 347, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"20.9.7.2 Football Scheduling Requirement. The institution shall schedule and play more than 50 percent of its football games against members of Division I-A or Division I-AA.

[20.9.7.2.1 through 20.9.7.2.3 unchanged.]

"20.9.7.2.4 Geographical Waiver — Division I-AA. The Division I Steering Committee, by two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the provisions of 20.9.7.2 for a Division I-AA institution that does not offer athletically related financial aid in the sport of football, or which offers fewer than 20 percent of the maximum allowable number of scholarships in Division I-AA and was classified in Division II prior to September 1993, if it is determined that fewer than six other Division I-AA football programs exist within a 500-mile radius of the institution's campus that do not offer athletically related financial aid in the sport of football or which offer fewer than 20 percent of the maximum allowable number of scholarships in Division I-AA and were classified in Division II prior to September 1993."

Source: NCAA Council; all members of the Ivy Group, Bucknell University, Colgate University, Fordham University, College of the Holy Cross, Illinois State University, Lafayette College and Lehigh University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: With the failure of the Division I-AAA football proposal at the 1992 NCAA Convention, all Division I members that currently sponsor Division II or III football will be required to reclassify their football programs to Division I-AA, effective September 1, 1993, or eventually be left with no option other than to discontinue the sponsorship of football. Because of their geographical location, a very limited number of these institutions find themselves isolated from other Division I-AA limited scholarship and non-scholarship football programs and, therefore, will be unable to find a sufficient number of opponents with similar football programs to satisfy the Division I-AA scheduling requirements. This waiver will establish an opportunity for appropriate relief for those institutions and will enable them to continue to sponsor their football programs without facing excessive travel and maintenance expenses to secure viable schedules.

Action: Adopted by Division I-AA.

NO. 134 MEMBERSHIP—TWO-SEASON REQUIREMENT

Intent: To specify that institutions shall conduct at least one sport for each gender in two out of three sport seasons.

Constitution: Amend 3.2, pages 8-11, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"3.2 ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP

"3.2.1 Eligibility Requirements

[3.2.1.1 through 3.2.1.3 unchanged.]

"3.2.1.4 Four-Sport/Three Two-Season Requirement. The institution shall sponsor and conduct a representative schedule in a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports that involve all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females and four varsity intercollegiate sports that involve all-female teams, subject to the requirements of the institution's conference(s), if any. At least one sport involving an all-male team or a mixed team of males and females and at least one sport involving an all-female team shall be conducted in every at least two sport seasons. See 3.2.4.10 for details of the member's obligations in meeting this requirement.

[Remainder of 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 unchanged.]

"3.2.4 Conditions and Obligations of Membership

[3.2.4.1 through 3.2.4.9 unchanged.]

"3.2.4.10 Guidelines for the Four-Sport/Three Two-Season Requirement. To meet the four-sport/three two-season provision, active member institutions are obligated to comply with the requirements set forth in the following subsections:

[3.2.4.10.1 and 3.2.4.10.2 unchanged.]

"3.2.4.10.3 Single-Gender Institution Exception. Institutions that sponsor and conduct athletics programs for only one sex need not meet the four-sport/three two-season requirement for the other sex.

[3.2.4.10.4 unchanged.]

"3.2.4.10.5 Three Two-Season Sport Waiver. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the requirement that an active member shall conduct at least one sport in every at least two sport seasons if the institution is precluded by its academic calendar and climatic conditions from conducting a sport in a particular season."

[Remainder of 3.2 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal allows each institution to sponsor its four sports during the seasons that best fit its climatic conditions, geographic location and academic calendar. It maintains a well-rounded program by continuing to require minimum sports sponsorship numbers with less restriction on the seasons in which the sports are sponsored. This change also can be a cost-cutting measure for institutions that must now rent indoor facilities because it is too cold and/or snowy to have spring sports outdoors and for those who must pay to keep student-athletes on campus after the academic year is completed in order to finish the sport season.

Action: Defeated (323-249, 27 abstentions).

NO. 135 DIVISION I MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS—FINANCIAL AID

Intent: To permit any Division I institution that does not award athletically related financial aid to be exempted from the minimum awards requirements specified in 20.9.1.2.

Bylaws: Amend 20.9.1.2.5, page 341, as follows:
[Division I only]

"20.9.1.2.5 Exemptions — No Institutional Athletics Aid. Member institutions that do not award athletically related financial aid in any sport as of January 11, 1991, shall be exempted from the minimum requirements"

Source: Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; Oregon State University; St. Mary's College (California); Santa Clara University; Stanford University; University of Southern California; University of Washington, and Washington State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1995.

Rationale: This legislation will permit a Division I institution that is philosophically supportive of nonscholarship athletics programs to do so without meeting the financial aid requirements of 20.9.1. At this time, only a limited number of Division I member institutions do not give athletically related aid. Since these schools have never given such aid and have always been in Division I, they benefit from the current legislative exceptions. However, no method exists to permit other institutions that do not award scholarships to move into Division I without meeting these financial aid requirements. This legislation would allow a Division I institution that wants to maintain a broad-based program without scholarships to compete with like institutions in terms of sports offered. It also would allow another option for schools to compete in Division I and contain costs.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 136 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP—DIVISION I

Intent: To permit a Division I member to meet the minimum sports sponsorship requirements by sponsoring six all-male or mixed teams and eight all-female teams as an additional alternative to the present requirement of sponsoring seven all-male or mixed teams and seven all-female teams.

Bylaws: Amend 20.9.3, page 341, as follows:
[Division I only]

"20.9.3 Sports Sponsorship. A member of Division I shall sponsor in Division I a minimum of:

[20.9.3-(a) and 20.9.3-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) **Six varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, based on the minimum requirements of 20.9.3.3 and involving all-male or mixed teams of males and females, and**

"(d) Eight varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, based on the minimum requirements of 20.9.3.3 and involving all-female teams."

Source: All members of the Big Sky Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1994.

Rationale: Many institutions are finding it more and more difficult to meet Title IX requirements because of the number of male student-athletes involved in the sport of football. This legislation simply would give an institution the option of sponsoring six men's sports and eight women's sports as an alternative to the current sponsorship requirement of seven men's sports and seven women's sports if it was to the institution's advantage for Title IX purposes.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 137 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP—INDOOR AND OUTDOOR TRACK

Intent: To specify that indoor and outdoor track and field shall be counted as one sport for purposes of fulfilling Division I sports sponsorship criteria.

Bylaws: Amend 20.9.3.3.6, page 343, as follows:
[Division I only]

"20.9.3.3.6 Indoor and Outdoor Track. A Division I institution may receive credit for sponsoring both indoor and outdoor track, provided its team participates in a total of at least 12 indoor and outdoor meets during the year, including at least four indoor and four outdoor meets. **A Division I institution shall count indoor and outdoor track as a single sport.**"

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Although the student-athletes participating in indoor and outdoor track usually are the same people, they may be counted twice, inasmuch as the sports may be counted as separate sports. The Division I sports sponsorship requirements are intended to assure competitive opportunities for student-athletes. Counting the same student-athletes twice runs counter to this intent.

Action: Referred by Division I to Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics.

NO. 138 WOMEN'S BASKETBALL SCHEDULING REQUIREMENTS — DIVISION II

Intent: To specify that a Division II member institution shall schedule and play at least 50 percent of its women's basketball games in an academic year against members of Divisions I or II.

Bylaws: Amend 20.10.4.2, page 350, as follows:
[Division II only]

"20.10.4.2 Basketball. A member of Division II shall schedule and play at least 50 percent of its men's basketball games and

50 percent of its women's basketball games in an academic year against members of Divisions I or II."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The Division II Steering Committee believes that the same scheduling requirements should apply to women's basketball that apply to men's basketball.

Action: Adopted by Division II.

Awards/Expenses/Amateurism

NO. 139 DEVELOPMENTAL TRAINING EXPENSES

Intent: To permit an individual to receive actual and necessary expenses for developmental training programs conducted during any vacation period published in the institution's catalog, as opposed to only during the summer vacation period, provided the programs do not conflict with the individual's participation in institutional competition.

Bylaws: Amend 12.1.2.5, page 69, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"12.1.2.5 Exception for Developmental Training Programs. An individual may receive actual and necessary expenses for developmental training programs conducted and supervised by the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC) or the appropriate national governing body (NGB) (or, for foreign student-athletes, the equivalent organization of that nation), even if the programs include no competition, provided the programs are conducted during the individual's summer academic vacation period or any other vacation period published in the institution's official catalog and the activity does not conflict with dates of institutional competition."

Source: NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee)

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will encourage the participation of Olympic sport athletes in developmental training programs while ensuring that their participation in these training activities does not conflict with dates of institutional competition.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 140 MEDICAL EXAMINATION

Intent: To permit student-athletes to receive one on-campus medical examination during the academic year from a professional league's recognized scouting bureau without jeopardizing their eligibility in that sport.

Bylaws: Amend 12.2.1.2 by adding new 12.2.1.2.1, page 70, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.2.1.2.1 Medical-Examination Exception. A professional

league's scouting bureau is permitted to conduct one medical examination per student-athlete during the academic year without jeopardizing the student-athlete's eligibility in that sport, provided the examination does not occur off campus."

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Current NCAA regulations prohibit professional athletics teams from conducting medical examinations during the academic year for student-athletes in any sport. The Professional Sports Liaison Committee believes that if a professional league's recognized scouting bureau is permitted to conduct one medical examination (e.g., psychological profiles, eye and ear examinations and biodex examinations), a professional league team would be better able to assess the student-athlete's potential for success in professional athletics. This, in turn, will give student-athletes a better indication of their potential as professional athletes and help them to determine whether remaining in college would be a more desirable alternative. The stipulation that only one on-campus medical examination may be provided should limit potential disruptions to academic and athletics schedules, especially if a member institution's representatives assist in scheduling the examinations.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 141 MEDIA GUIDES

Intent: To permit a member institution or member conference to utilize noninstitutional outlets for the sale of an institution's (or conference's) media guide.

Bylaws: Amend 12.5.1.7, pages 75-76, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.5.1.7 Promotion by Third Party of Highlight Film or Media Guide. Any party other than the institution or a student-athlete (e.g., a distribution company) may sell and distribute an institutional highlight film or videotape or an institutional or conference media guide that contains the names and pictures of enrolled student-athletes only if:

"(a) The institution specifically designates any agency that is authorized to receive orders for the film or videotape or media guide;

"(b) Sales and distribution activities have the written approval of the institution's athletics director;

"(c) The distribution company or a retail store is precluded from using the name or picture of an enrolled student-athlete in any poster or other advertisement to promote the sale or distribution of the film or media guide, and

"(d) There is no indication in the makeup or wording of the advertisement that the squad members, individually or collectively, or the institution endorses the product or services of the advertiser."

Source: NCAA Council (Communications Committee)

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Member institutions should have the right to sell their media guides in any manner they see fit. Bylaw 12.5.1.7 specifically permits the sale of institutional highlight videos at non-institutional outlets. Independent publishers generate profits for themselves, which are not shared with institutions or conferences, by selling preseason publications that contain names and likenesses of student-athletes. Such publishers also generate revenue by publishing magazines and newspapers that report solely on an institution's athletics activities, using names and likenesses of student-athletes without sharing revenue with the institution. It has been suggested that the current restriction is aimed at competitive equity among institutions, but this restriction can be detrimental to institutions that have no sophisticated internal distribution systems or have no institutionally controlled stores that are easily accessible to the general public.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 142 TRAINING-TABLE MEALS

Intent: To preclude Division I institutions from providing training-table meals to student-athletes outside the playing season.

A. **Bylaws:** Amend 16.5.1, page 193, as follows:
[Division I only]

"16.5 HOUSING AND MEALS

"16.5.1 Permissible. Identified housing and meal benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics that may be financed by the institution are.
[16.5.1-(a) and 16.5.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Training-Table Meals — Division I. In Division I, an institution may provide only one training-table meal per day to a student-athlete during the *academic year playing seasons (including spring football practice) in the student's sport* on those days when regular institutional dining facilities are open."

[Remainder of 16.5.1 unchanged.]

B. **Bylaws:** Amend 16.5.2 by adding new 16.5.2.3, page 194, as follows:

[Division I only]

"16.5.2 Nonpermissible.

[16.5.2.1 and 16.5.2.2 unchanged.]

"16.5.2.3 Training-Table Meals. An institution may not provide training-table meals to a student-athlete outside the playing seasons."

Source: All members of the Pacific-10 Conference and all members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: Part A effective August 1, 1996; Part B effective August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The elimination of out-of-season training tables is intended to extend the principle of cost containment.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 143 ATHLETICS HOUSING

Intent: To specify that institutions that do not differentiate between student-athletes and students generally in their housing assignment policies are exempt from the limitations set forth in Bylaw 16.5.2.2.

Bylaws: Amend 16.5.2.2 by adding new 16.5.2.2.3, page 194, as follows:

[Division I only]

"16.5.2.2.3 Exception — Nondiscriminatory Housing Policies. The prohibition against the use of athletics dormitories or blocks does not apply when the institution demonstrates that its housing assignment policies do not differentiate between student-athletes and students generally."

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Effective Date: August 1, 1996.

Rationale: The narrow definition of athletics dormitories and blocks means that an institution with a high percentage of student-athletes, in which athletes are assigned housing through the same procedures as students generally and with no special treatment, inadvertently could violate this bylaw as it currently is written.

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 144 PREGAME HOUSING

Intent: To eliminate off-campus or extra-cost housing for the home team the night before a home contest in all sports on those days when institutional dormitories are open.

Bylaws: Amend 16.8.2 by adding new 16.8.2.5, page 197, as follows:

[Division I only]

"16.8.2.5 Housing Benefits. The institution may not provide off-campus or extra-cost housing to the home team the night before a home contest in any sport on those days when institutional dormitories are open."

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: This proposal is intended to contain housing costs incidental to competition by requiring that institutions house student-athletes on campus whenever possible. It would preclude the housing of student-athletes off campus or in other institutional facilities when residence halls are open.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 145 EXPENSES—TRAVEL-SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

Intent: To establish travel-squad limitations.

Bylaws: Amend 16.8.1.2 by adding new 16.8.1.2.2, page 196, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"16.8.1.2.2 Travel-Squad Limitations. There shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may travel to regular-season varsity competition held away from the institution's home facility, either at the institution's or the student-athlete's expense, as follows:

"Baseball.....22	Skiing, Men.....12
Basketball, Men.....12	Skiing, Women.....12
Basketball, Women.....12	Soccer, Men.....18
Cross Country, Men.....10	Soccer, Women.....18
Cross Country, Women.....10	Softball.....20
Fencing, Men.....12	Swimming, Men.....20
Fencing, Women.....12	Swimming, Women.....20
Field Hockey.....16	Tennis, Men.....8
Football.....60	Tennis, Women.....8
Golf, Men.....7	Track, Indoor, Men.....25
Golf, Women.....7	Track, Indoor, Women.....22
Gymnastics, Men.....13	Track, Outdoor, Men.....30
Gymnastics, Women.....12	Track, Outdoor, Women.....26
Ice Hockey.....20	Volleyball, Men.....12
Lacrosse, Men.....32	Volleyball, Women.....12
Lacrosse, Women.....32	Water Polo.....15
Rifle.....12	Wrestling.....13

"16.8.1.2.2.1 Traditional Rival Exception. In each sport, there shall be no travel-squad limit for contests played on one trip each season against one traditional rival."

Source: All members of the Pacific-10 Conference

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: While many conferences impose restrictions on travel-squad size, these restrictions do not apply to nonconference competition. Having a national standard will reduce costs significantly.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 145-1 EXPENSES — TRAVEL-SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

Intent: To permit two additional student-athletes to travel when an away trip involves more than one contest date.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 145, 16.8.1.2.2, by adding new 16.8.1.2.2.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"16.8.1.2.2.2 Consecutive Away Contests. In each sport, the permissible travel-squad limit shall be increased by two when contests are scheduled to be played away from home on more than one date within three days, provid-

ed the team does not return to campus between the contests."

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Rationale: For institutions that minimize missed class time by scheduling consecutive away contests over a two- or three-day trip, it is critical to permit additional players to travel in case of injuries.

Action: Not moved.

NO. 145-2 EXPENSES — TRAVEL-SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

Intent: To revise proposed travel-squad size limits as specified.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 145, 16.8.1.2.2, as follows:

[Federated provisions, all divisions, divided vote]

"16.8.1.2.2 Travel-Squad Limitations. There shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may travel to regular-season varsity competition held away from the institution's home facility, either at the institution's or the student-athlete's expense, as follows:

"Basketball, Men.....12	15	Soccer, Women.....18	20
Basketball, Women.....12	15	Swimming, Men.....20	26
Cross Country, Men.....10	12	Swimming, Women.....20	26
Cross Country, Women.....10	12	Tennis, Men.....8	10
Field Hockey.....16	20	Tennis, Women.....8	10
Football.....60	62	Track, Indoor, Men.....25	40
Golf, Men.....7	8	Track, Indoor, Women.....22	37
Golf, Women.....7	8	Track, Outdoor, Men.....30	44
Soccer, Men.....18	20	Track, Outdoor, Women.....26	40"

[Remainder of 16.8.1.2.2 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Rationale: These travel limits have been in effect in the Ivy Group and have proven to be both financially reasonable and competitively sound.

Action: Not moved.

NO. 145-3 EXPENSES — TRAVEL-SQUAD SIZE LIMITATIONS

Intent: To increase from 20 to 21 the proposed travel-squad size limit in ice hockey.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 145, 16.8.1.2.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"16.8.1.2.2 Travel-Squad Limitations. There shall be a limit on the number of participants (players) who may travel to regular-season varsity competition held away from the institution's home facility, either at the institution's or the student-athlete's expense, as follows:

"Ice Hockey.....20 21"

[Remainder of 16.8.1.2.2 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the North Atlantic Conference; University of Alaska Anchorage; Brown University; Clarkson University; College University; Cornell University; Dartmouth College; University of Denver; Harvard University; Michigan Technological University; University of North Dakota; Northern Michigan University; Princeton University; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; St. Cloud State University; St. Lawrence University; Union College (New York), and Yale University.

Rationale: Traditionally, 19 or 20 student-athletes play during each ice hockey contest. Frequently, ice hockey teams play back-to-back contests on each road trip. To protect the competitive strength of the squad in the case of injury and/or illness, each ice hockey team should be permitted to travel with 21 players.

Action: Not moved.

NO. 146 RESOLUTION: TRAVEL-SQUAD LIMITS

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, athletics programs continue to face major financial issues, including containing costs in light of rising travel expenditures; and

"Whereas, current NCAA legislation does not place limits on the number of student-athletes for whom an institution may provide travel expenses;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council study or refer to a committee the implementation of travel-squad limits at the national level; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Council consider the recommendations from this study and the sponsorship of such legislation at the 1994 NCAA Convention."

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 147 EXPENSES FOR COMPETITION

Intent: To establish mode-of-travel restrictions for off-campus competition and to provide for exceptions to or waivers of this legislation.

Bylaws: Amend 16.8.1.2 by adding new 16.8.1.2.2, page 196, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provisions, all divisions, common vote]

"16.8.1.2.2 Mode-of-Travel Restrictions — Regular Season Through Conference Championships. An institution shall provide ground travel expenses to a student-athlete for participation in athletics competition according to the mileage provisions specified below (based on mileage established by the Automobile Association of America).

"16.8.1.2.2.1 All Sports (Including Football). For competition within 150 miles of the institution's campus, mode of travel shall be by ground transportation (e.g., bus, automobile or van).

"16.8.1.2.2.2 Football. For competition within 250 miles of the institution's campus, mode of travel shall be by ground transportation (e.g., bus) to the competition

site. Charter aircraft may be used for the return portion of the trip.

"16.8.1.2.2.3 Exceptions or Waivers. Exceptions to or waivers of this legislation shall be administered by the conference members of the Association or, in the case of an independent institution, by the NCAA, and shall be reported on an annual basis to the NCAA."

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: The restriction on air travel is proposed to contain travel costs associated with off-campus competition. In football, a provision to permit the use of charter aircraft has been included to expedite the team's return to campus for trips within 250 miles.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 148 TRAVEL EXPENSES—EXCEPTION

Intent: To specify that the limitation on travel expenses prior to athletics events does not apply to the United States Gymnastics Federation (USGF) collegiate championships.

Bylaws: Amend 16.8.1.2.1.1, page 196, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.8.1.2.1.1 Exceptions. These travel-expense restrictions do not apply in the following circumstances:

[16.8.1.2.1.1-(a) through 16.8.1.2.1.1-(f) unchanged.]

"(g) Travel prior to the United States Gymnastics Federation (USGF) collegiate championships."

Source: All members of the Pacific West Conference and Texas Woman's University.

Effective Date. Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal would provide the same travel-expense exception for the USGF collegiate gymnastics championships as is provided to similar events.

Action. Adopted

Governance

NO. 149 PRINCIPLE OF NONDISCRIMINATION

Intent: To establish a principle of nondiscrimination in the Association's principles for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics.

Constitution: Amend Constitution 2 by adding new 2.5, page 3, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"2.5 THE PRINCIPLE OF NONDISCRIMINATION

"The Association shall promote an atmosphere of respect for and sensitivity to the dignity of every person. It is the policy of the Association to refrain from discrimination with respect to its governance policies, educational

programs, activities and employment policies."

Source: NCAA Council (Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Council believes that it is important that the Association's principles for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics contain a principle related to nondiscrimination.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 150 NCAA STAFF INTERPRETATIONS

Intent: To specify that an interpretation of NCAA legislation issued by the NCAA legislative services staff is not binding.

Constitution: Amend 5.4.1.2, pages 37-38, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"5.4.1.2 Interpretations Process

"5.4.1.2.1 *Response to Request* The legislative services staff shall respond to a request from a member institution for an interpretation of NCAA rules. Such an interpretation is binding on the institution unless it is modified by the Interpretations Committee

"5.4.1.2.2 **5.4.1.2.1 Review.** A member institution may request a review by **that** the Interpretations Committee of any interpretation provided by the legislative services staff **review the application of NCAA legislation.** Such a request must be processed in writing by the institution's conference or by one of the five individuals who are authorized to request such interpretations on behalf of the institution [i.e., chief executive officer, faculty athletics representative, athletics director, senior woman administrator, compliance coordinator, or designated substitute(s) for the chief executive officer and/or athletics director, as specified in writing to the national office]"

[5.4.1.2.3 and 5.4.1.2.4 renumbered as 5.4.1.2.2 and 5.4.1.2.3, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will encourage institutions and conferences to take greater responsibility for understanding and applying NCAA rules. The NCAA staff's role will return to one of assisting the membership rather than the current situation, which often places the staff in the position of appearing to direct members to take certain actions. Accordingly, this proposal will enhance the relationship between the staff and the membership without lessening the understanding of the proper application of NCAA rules or decreasing staff services. Where issues that may have national impact need to be addressed more formally, the Interpretations Committee-Council process remains in place. The staff will continue its efforts to provide consistent responses to requests for assistance and to improve a data base of information to assist members in applying the legislation it has adopted

Action: Referred to Legislative Review Committee.

NO. 151 RESOLUTION: FEDERATION BY SPORT

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, American higher education is faced with an economic climate requiring cost-reduction and cost-containment measures; and

"Whereas, gender-equity issues are causing member institutions to reexamine and restructure their athletics departments; and

"Whereas, member institutions are confronted with the inability to fund all of their athletics programs at the same level; and

"Whereas, the breadth and complexity of NCAA rules and regulations continue to increase with a disproportionate growth in costs and paperwork; and

"Whereas, member institutions need to have appropriate competitive groupings for each sport; and

"Whereas, member institutions that want to compete at the highest level in a grouping of sports should have the ability to do so; and

"Whereas, at the 1992 NCAA Convention, Richard D. Schultz, executive director of the NCAA, said in his State of the Association Address to the Convention delegates, '[T]he vast majority of the rules are made for football and basketball, and then we let them fall out and impact on the other sports. I think it is time for us to begin a study as to the potential value of federating our rules on a sport-by-sport basis. While it may take some time to do this, we may find that it would be far more satisfactory, less frustrating and actually cost effective to adjust our rules in this way;' and

"Whereas, the concept of 'federation by sport' is not intended to decrease the minimum sports sponsorship requirements of Division I;

"Now, Therefore, *Be It Resolved*, that the NCAA Council appoint a committee to study the concept of federation by sport; and

"*Be It Further Resolved*, that this committee report to the 1994 Convention concerning the feasibility of developing legislation on this topic to be considered by the membership at the 1995 NCAA Convention."

Source: Boston College, University of Connecticut; Georgetown University; Gallaudet University; La Salle University; University of Maryland, College Park; Providence College; St. John's University (New York); St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania); Seton Hall University; Syracuse University, and Villanova University.

Action: Adopted.

Championships

NO. 152 CHAMPIONSHIP CRITERIA—MINIMUM SPONSORSHIP EXCEPTION

Intent: To specify that National Collegiate Championships that do not meet the minimum percentage sponsorship criteria for maintaining the championships may continue to be sponsored during the 1994-95 academic year.

Bylaws: Amend 18.2.10.2, page 315, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"18.2.10.2 National Collegiate Championships Exception. During the 1991-92, 1992-93, and 1993-94 and 1994-95 academic years, an existing National Collegiate Championship shall not be canceled, nor shall transportation and per diem expenses be discontinued, due to that championship's failure to meet the minimum percentage or numerical sponsorship requirements for maintaining the championship. Upon the expiration of this legislative exception, any year(s) during the 1991-94 95 period that a championship fell below the applicable minimum sponsorship percentage set forth in 18.2.3 or 18.2.4 shall count toward the two consecutive-year limitation."

Source: Brigham Young University; University of Illinois; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Springfield College; U.S. Air Force Academy; U.S. Naval Academy, and College of William and Mary.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will protect those National Collegiate Championships that may face cancellation after the 1993-94 academic year. The NCAA Executive Committee conducted a comprehensive review of the entire championships program at its August 1992 meeting. However, any positive action the Executive Committee may take to protect certain national collegiate championships may be moot for those events that take place in the fall of 1994, unless action is taken at the 1993 Convention.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 153 CHAMPIONSHIP CRITERIA—MINIMUM SPONSORSHIP EXEMPTION

Intent: To permit championships that do not meet minimum sponsorship criteria to be sponsored without the provision of transportation and per diem expenses.

A. Bylaws: Amend 18.2.11, page 315, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"18.2.11 Exemptions. The following are exempt from the minimum sponsorship percentage requirements of 18.2.3 and 18.2.4 for championship continuation:

[18.2.11-(a) through 18.2.11-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) A championship that fails to meet the net-receipt requirement specified in 18.2.11-(a) may be continued without the provision of the transportation and per diem expenses specified in 31.4.6.1."

B. Bylaws: Amend 31.4.6.1, page 413, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"31.4.6.1 Division I and National Collegiate Championships. For Division I and National Collegiate Championships, the Association shall provide transportation expenses and per diem allowances for the official traveling parties of competing institutions in team championships. In individual-team championships, the Association shall provide transportation and per diem allowances for competing individuals and for the following num-

bers of nonathletes: two nonathletes from each team selected, for one nonathlete for institutions with from one to four individuals selected, and for two nonathletes for institutions with more than four individuals selected. **Championships described in 18.2.11-(d) will not receive transportation and per diem allowances."**

Source: University of California, Berkeley; Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Ohio State University; University of Oklahoma; Springfield College; Stanford University; U.S. Air Force Academy; University of Washington, and College of William and Mary.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Championships that fail to satisfy the minimum sponsorship requirements and fail to produce revenue under current financial regulations should have the opportunity to continue as long as individual institutions, through sponsorship of appropriate sports programs, wish to send their athletes to such championships. Since the institutions then will bear transportation and per diem expenses, the cost of conducting such championships would decrease radically, inasmuch as transportation and per diem costs are the largest expenses in conducting championships. Championships that feature athletes competing at world-class levels of competency should be encouraged, regardless of financial considerations. Such championships can fulfill the NCAA's stated purposes and fundamental policies as much as revenue-producing championships.

Action: Not moved.

NO. 154 DIVISION I CHAMPIONSHIPS ELIGIBILITY

Intent: To permit a Division I institution that conducts a Division II or Division III football program, but must reclassify its football program in Division I for the 1993-94 academic year in accordance with Bylaw 20.4.1.1, to be eligible to participate immediately in the Division I-AA Football Championship without satisfying the two-year conformity period set forth in Bylaw 18.4.2.2-(b).

Bylaws: Amend 18.4.2.2, page 318, as follows:

[Division I only]

"18.4.2.2 Division I Championships. To be eligible to enter a team or an individual in an NCAA championship, a Division I member institution also shall:

[18.4.2.2-(a) through 18.4.2.2-(c) unchanged.]

"18.4.2.2.1 Exception. In the sport of football, a Division I institution that conducts a Division II or Division III football program and must reclassify its football program in Division I for the 1993-94 academic year in accordance with Bylaw 20.4.1.1 is not subject to the two-year conformity period set forth in 18.4.2.2-(b)."

[18.4.2.2.1, renumbered as 18.4.2.2.2, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Interpretations Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Currently, Bylaw 18.4.2.2-(b) specifies that a Division I institution is not eligible to compete in a Division I championship unless the institution has operated for a period of two years in conformity with the Division I freshman eligibility and transfer eligibility requirements for practice, competition and financial aid. A Division I institution that currently conducts a Division II or Division III football program, but must reclassify its football program in Division I for the 1993-94 academic year per Bylaw 20.4.1.1, may have difficulty meeting these requirements in order to participate in the 1993 and 1994 Division I-AA Football Championships. The provisions of Bylaw 18.4.2.2 governing eligibility should not prevent an institution that is forced by legislation to reclassify its football program in Division I from participating immediately in the Division I-AA Football Championship

Action: Adopted by Division I.

NO. 155 RESOLUTION: DIVISION III MEN'S AND WOMEN'S SOCCER

[Division III only]

"Whereas, the selection of teams to participate in the Division III Men's and Women's Soccer Championships occurs one week earlier than the selection dates in Divisions I and II, which dictates that the Division III soccer season end the last week in October; and

"Whereas, the Division III Men's Soccer Championship is played the weekend prior to Thanksgiving and the Division III Women's Soccer Championship is played two weekends prior to Thanksgiving; and

"Whereas, in contrast, the Divisions I and II Men's Soccer Championships are played two weeks later than Division III; and

"Whereas, weather conditions and final exam schedules are not differentiated by divisional status across the country, which is the contention of the men's and women's soccer committees; and

"Whereas, financial constraints frequently prevent institutions that start classes after August 24 from bringing in student-athletes who compete in fall sports on August 24, thus abbreviating the Division III soccer season unnecessarily;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Division III Championships Committee direct the men's and women's soccer committees to study the effect of a decision to delay their selections of Division III championships participants by one week, comparable to the Divisions I and II selection dates; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Division III Championships Committee explore the feasibility of a final round Division III Men's and Women's Soccer Championship site in an area of suitable climate, and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that this information be reported to the Division III Championships Committee and the NCAA Executive Committee not later than their August 1993 meeting."

Source: All members of the Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Action: Adopted by Division III.

Committees

NO. 156 BASKETBALL OFFICIATING COMMITTEE

Intent: To increase from 12 to 16 the membership of the Basketball Officiating Committee, and to specify that the additional members shall represent men's basketball officiating interests and women's basketball officiating interests in Divisions II and III, respectively.

Bylaws: Amend 21.3.3.1 and 21.3.3.2, pages 360-361, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.3.1 Composition. The Basketball Officiating Committee shall consist of 12 16 members, including six individuals representing Division I men's basketball officiating interests and, six individuals representing Division I women's basketball officiating interests, **one individual representing Division II men's basketball officiating interests, one individual representing Division II women's basketball officiating interests, one individual representing Division III men's basketball officiating interests and one individual representing Division III women's basketball officiating interests.**

[Remainder of 21.3.3.1 unchanged.]

"21.3.3.2 Duties. The committee shall monitor the Divisions I, II and III men's and women's basketball officiating programs."

Source: NCAA Council (Divisions II and III Steering Committees).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal will help to improve the quality of the Association's men's and women's basketball officiating programs in Divisions II and III.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 157 RECRUITING COMMITTEE

Intent: To specify that the membership of the NCAA Recruiting Committee shall include at least one active Division I coach in team sports other than football and basketball and at least one active Division I coach in individual sports.

Bylaws: Amend 21.3.21.1, page 365, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.21.1 Composition. The Recruiting Committee shall consist of 10 members, including three positions allocated for men, three allocated for women and four unallocated, one of which shall be an undergraduate student-athlete who is a varsity letter winner. The committee membership shall include at least one active Division I football coach and, at least one active Division I basketball coach, **at least one active Division I coach in a team sport other than football and basketball and at least one active Division I individual sport coach.**"

Source: Brigham Young University; University of Cincinnati; University of Florida; University of New Haven; New Mexico State University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Washington

State University, and Western Illinois University.

Effective Date: September 1, 1993; effective for committee vacancies on or after September 1, 1993.

Rationale: This proposal will provide Division I team sports other than football and basketball and individual sports in Division I the type of direct representation on the Recruiting Committee now only afforded to the sports of football and basketball. Recruiting issues affect other Division I sports very differently than they affect football and basketball. Input at the annual Division I coaches meeting has made this fact eminently clear. This proposal will allow for dialogue and input by all other Division I sports directly to the committee making recommendations to the NCAA Council related to recruiting.

Action: Not moved

NO. 158 SPECIAL EVENTS COMMITTEE

Intent: To limit the composition of the NCAA Special Events committee to individuals who represent Division I-A institutions; to specify that at least one member be appointed from each member conference whose primary representative participates in a certified bowl game that is in full compliance with Executive Regulation 31.5.1, and to eliminate the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee.

Bylaws: Amend 21.3.24, page 366, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.24 Special Events Committee

"21.3.24.1 Composition. The Special Events Committee shall consist of 12 members, *including at least eight all of whom shall represent Division I-A institutions, including at least one of them from each geographical district except District I, conference whose primary representative participates in a certified postseason football game that is in full compliance with Executive Regulation 31.5.1 and four additional members.* The committee shall include at least two women. [21.3.24.2 unchanged.]

"21.3.24.3 Special Operating Rules. The eight Division I-A representatives shall act as a subcommittee on postseason football matters, with its duties and functions set forth in 18.7 and 30.8. The full committee shall act on issues involving special events, as set forth in 30.2.2.1."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Events Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The proposal will revise the composition of the Special Events Committee to reflect that segment of the membership directly affected by the committee's actions.

Action: Adopted by all three divisions.

NO. 158-1 SPECIAL EVENTS COMMITTEE

Intent: To specify that one member of the Special Events Committee shall be unallocated.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 158, 21.3.24.1, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3.24 Special Events Committee

"21.3.24.1 Composition. The Special Events Committee shall consist of 12 members, *all 11 of whom shall represent Division I-A institutions, including at least one from each conference whose primary representative participates in a certified postseason football game that is in full compliance with Executive Regulation 31.5.1, and one additional member.* The committee shall include at least two women."

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Rationale: The Special Events Committee certifies events in which Division I-AA institutions participate. It also establishes requirements concerning minimum Division I-A scheduling for bowl eligibility, which affect Division I-AA institutions. For these reasons, Division I-AA institutions should be permitted representation on the committee.

Action: Withdrawn

NO. 159 DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL COMMITTEE

Intent: To increase from four to five the size of the Division I-AA Football Committee, and to specify that the additional member shall be selected from an institution that is eligible for but elects not to participate in the Division I-AA Football Championship.

Bylaws: Amend 21.6.13, page 372, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.6.13 Football Committee, Division I-AA. The Division I-AA Football Committee shall consist of *four five* members, including one elected from each Division I-AA football region. In the event that there are fewer than four regions, the additional member(s) shall be elected at large. **One member shall be from an institution whose team is eligible for but elects not to participate in the Division I-AA Football Championship, and that member shall not be eligible to vote on matters directly affecting the championship.**"

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Effective Date: August 1, 1993

Rationale: This amendment proposes to increase the membership of the Division I-AA Football Committee in order to allow for the full representation of the Division I-AA membership.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 160 DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL COMMITTEE

Intent: To limit membership on the Division I-AA Football Committee to individuals from institutions that are eligible for and elect to participate in the Division I-AA Football Championship.

Bylaws: Amend 21.6.13, page 372, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.6.13 Football Committee, Division I-AA. The Division I-AA Football Committee shall consist of four members, including one elected from each Division I-AA football region. In the event that there are fewer than four regions, the additional member(s) shall be elected at large. **Members of the committee shall be from institutions whose teams are eligible for and elect to participate in the Division I-AA Football Championship.**"

Source: All members of the Big Sky Conference

Effective Date: August 1, 1993.

Rationale: Imposing the requirement that a member of the Division I-AA Football Committee must represent an institution that is eligible for and elects to participate in the Division I-AA Football Championship will assure that the committee is composed of individuals who are committed to the Division I-AA championship and that the championship is governed by and administered by those people who have a vested interest in it

Action: Withdrawn.

Roll-Call Voting

This is a summary of the 55 roll-call votes that were conducted at the 1993 NCAA Convention in Dallas.

Each column represents a roll-call vote at the Convention. The number at the head of each column is the proposal number. In instances where the vote involved only member institutions in one division, that

division also is indicated. Where letters are indicated, the reference is to parts of multipart proposals included in that vote.

Other codes in the headings are as follows: **REC** refers to a vote to reconsider; **MTR** refers to a motion to reconsider, and **REF** refers to a motion to refer the proposal for further study.

[illegible]

	4	18	46	47	48	49	26	48	49	27	28	30	31	34	34	34	18	15	15	50	51	51	52	53	53	54	55	56	56	57	58	59	60	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	154	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162	163	164	165	166	167	168	169	170	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	180	181	182	183	184	185	186	187	188	189	190	191	192	193	194	195	196	197	198	199	200	201	202	203	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212	213	214	215	216	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243	244	245	246	247	248	249	250	251	252	253	254	255	256	257	258	259	260	261	262	263	264	265	266	267	268	269	270	271	272	273	274	275	276	277	278	279	280	281	282	283	284	285	286	287	288	289	290	291	292	293	294	295	296	297	298	299	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351	352	353	354	355	356	357	358	359	360	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369	370	371	372	373	374	375	376	377	378	379	380	381	382	383	384	385	386	387	388	389	390	391	392	393	394	395	396	397	398	399	400	401	402	403	404	405	406	407	408	409	410	411	412	413	414	415	416	417	418	419	420	421	422	423	424	425	426	427	428	429	430	431	432	433	434	435	436	437	438	439	440	441	442	443	444	445	446	447	448	449	450	451	452	453	454	455	456	457	458	459	460	461	462	463	464	465	466	467	468	469	470	471	472	473	474	475	476	477	478	479	480	481	482	483	484	485	486	487	488	489	490	491	492	493	494	495	496	497	498	499	500	501	502	503	504	505	506	507	508	509	510	511	512	513	514	515	516	517	518	519	520	521	522	523	524	525	526	527	528	529	530	531	532	533	534	535	536	537	538	539	540	541	542	543	544	545	546	547	548	549	550	551	552	553	554	555	556	557	558	559	560	561	562	563	564	565	566	567	568	569	570	571	572	573	574	575	576	577	578	579	580	581	582	583	584	585	586	587	588	589	590	591	592	593	594	595	596	597	598	599	600	601	602	603	604	605	606	607	608	609	610	611	612	613	614	615	616	617	618	619	620	621	622	623	624	625	626	627	628	629	630	631	632	633	634	635	636	637	638	639	640	641	642	643	644	645	646	647	648	649	650	651	652	653	654	655	656	657	658	659	660	661	662	663	664	665	666	667	668	669	670	671	672	673	674	675	676	677	678	679	680	681	682	683	684	685	686	687	688	689	690	691	692	693	694	695	696	697	698	699	700	701	702	703	704	705	706	707	708	709	710	711	712	713	714	715	716	717	718	719	720	721	722	723	724	725	726	727	728	729	730	731	732	733	734	735	736	737	738	739	740	741	742	743	744	745	746	747	748	749	750	751	752	753	754	755	756	757	758	759	760	761	762	763	764	765	766	767	768	769	770	771	772	773	774	775	776	777	778	779	780	781	782	783	784	785	786	787	788	789	790	791	792	793	794	795	796	797	798	799	800	801	802	803	804	805	806	807	808	809	810	811	812	813	814	815	816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000
--	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

[illegible]

[illegible]

100

[illegible]

A vertical strip of a spiral-bound notebook, showing the binding and the edges of lined pages. The pages are white with horizontal ruling lines. The spiral binding is visible on the left side. The notebook is oriented vertically.

This image shows a vertical strip of a document, possibly a page from a book or a document. The strip is characterized by a repeating pattern of horizontal bars and wavy lines, which appear to be a heavily degraded or stylized representation of text. The pattern consists of dark, irregular horizontal bars of varying widths, separated by lighter, wavy lines. The overall appearance is that of a corrupted scan or a highly stylized graphic.Roll-Call Voting _____ A-179

[illegible]

[illegible][illegible]

A-184 _____ 1993 Convention Proceedings _____ Roll-Call Voting _____ A-185

Division I-A Voting Yes	110	112	18	102	103	103	0	0	61	0	0	0	75	0	0	55	87	0	0	20
Division I-A Voting No	0	0	95	13	0	0	0	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	30
Division I-A Voting Abstain	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Division I-AA Voting Yes	80	86	31	79	83	82	0	0	50	0	0	0	63	0	0	48	0	0	0	26
Division I-AA Voting No	0	0	57	11	9	6	0	38	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	45	0	0	0	54
Division I-AA Voting Abstain	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	33	0	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Division I-AAA Voting Yes	99	104	122	93	104	106	0	0	58	0	0	0	78	0	0	50	0	0	0	38
Division I-AAA Voting No	7	3	30	17	10	3	0	0	53	0	0	0	42	0	0	63	0	0	0	75
Division I-AAA Voting Abstain	1	1	3	3	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Division I-A Voting Yes	299	302	71	274	290	291	0	0	189	0	0	0	208	0	0	153	17	0	0	84

[illegible]

Member	15-1	15-2	15-3	15	17	17	30	30	10	17	10	40	15	41	20	20	22	42	40	23	43
	AM	A	BC						AC	BC	BC				BC	AC					
Division I Voting No	14	6	242	41	30	18	25	0	0	145	0	0	0	111	0	0	108	24	0	0	229
Division I Voting Abstain	12	1	4	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
Division II Voting Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Division II Voting No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Division II Voting Abstain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Division III Voting Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	43	0	0	0	45	0	64	0	0	8	228	0	0	104
Division III Voting No	0	0	0	0	0	0	215	201	0	0	0	214	0	197	0	0	0	19	0	0	156
Division III Voting Abstain	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	16	0	0	3
Total Members Voting Yes	289	302	71	274	290	291	22	43	160	179	39	49	209	64	98	153	87	228	98	84	104
Total Members Voting No	14	6	242	41	30	18	215	201	145	28	171	214	111	197	113	168	24	19	115	229	156
Total Members Voting Abstain	2	1	4	4	3	3	2	3	0	0	0	5	0	5	0	2	2	16	0	0	3

	44	10	45	46	47	25	46	40	27	28	30	31	34	34	30	10	10	15	15	50	51	51	52	53	53	54	55	55	56	57	58	70	70

Appendix C

87th Annual Convention Committees

Nominating Committee

Chair—Charles Cavagnaro

- I-1—Robert W. Mullen, La Salle University
- I-1—Sondra Norrell-Thomas, Howard University
- I-2—R. Daniel Beebe, Ohio Valley Conference
- I-2—Charles Cavagnaro, Memphis State University
- I-3—Del Brinkman, University of Kansas
- I-3—Linda G. Herman, Illinois State University
- I-4—Thomas C. Hansen, Pacific-10 Conference
- I-4—Jim G. Malik, San Diego State University
- II-1—Charles A. Eberle, Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
- II-2—Wallace Jackson, Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
- II-3—George W. Eastland, Saginaw Valley State University
- II-4—Janet R. Kittell, California State University, Chico
- III-1—Gregory L. Lockard, Montclair State College
- III-2—Dolores A. Bogard, State University College at Cortland
- III-3—James E. Foels, Oberlin College
- III-4—Curtis W. Tong, Pomona-Pitzer Colleges

Men's Committee on Committees

Chair—James W. Vick

- District 1—Chester S. Gladchuk, Boston College
- District 2—Susan Petersen-Lubow, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy
- District 3—Paul S. Griffin, University of South Florida
- District 4—Robert T. Becker, Saginaw Valley State University
- District 5—Prentice Gautt, Big Eight Conference
- District 6—James W. Vick, University of Texas at Austin
- District 7—Glen C. Tuckett, Brigham Young University
- District 8—G. Lynn Lashbrook, University of Alaska Fairbanks
- At Large—Marino H. Casem, Southern University, Baton Rouge
- At Large—Richard J. Hazelton, Trinity College (Connecticut)
- At Large—Daniel L. Bridges, California Institute of Technology
- At Large—James A. Martin, Tuskegee University

Women's Committee on Committees

Chair—Peggy J. Pruitt

- District 1—Laurie Priest, Mount Holyoke College
- District 2—Robertha Abney, Slippery Rock Univ. of Pennsylvania
- District 3—Bernadette V. McGlade, Georgia Institute of Technology
- District 4—Peggy J. Pruitt, Ohio University
- District 5—Andrea Myers, Indiana State University
- District 6—Margaret Harbison, East Texas State University
- District 7—Katherine E. Noble, University of Montana
- At Large—Carol M. Dunn, California State Univ. Los Angeles
- At Large—Janet D. Lucas, James Madison University
- At Large—Diane Milutinovich, California State University, Fresno
- At Large—Sandy Tillman, Emory University
- At Large—Joyce S. Wong, University of Rochester

Voting Committee

Chair—Katherine E. Noble

- District 1—Susan E. Chapman, Worcester State College
- District 2—Rich Petriccione, Iona College
- District 3—L. Douglas Johnson, University of Miami (Florida)
- District 4—Judy A. Kruckman, Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
- District 5—Don Bryant, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
- District 6—Tynes Hildebrand, Northwestern State University (Louisiana)
- District 7—Larry R. Gerlach, University of Utah
- District 8—Barbara G. Walker, University of Oregon
- At Large—Sallie Beard, Missouri Southern State College
- At Large—Pete Chapman, Wayne State College (Nebraska)
- At Large—Kathy Lindahl, Michigan State University
- At Large—Katherine E. Noble, University of Montana
- At Large—William Thomas, Tennessee State University

Memorial Resolutions Committee

Chair—Catherine C. Haker

- Allen F. Ackerman, University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh
- Catherine C. Hacker, College of St. Rose
- Judy W. Rose, University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Credentials Committee

Chair—Michael M. Gilleran

- Barbara Bickford, Brandeis University
- Michael M. Gilleran, West Coast Conference
- Ronnie O. Spry, Paine College

Parliamentarian

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

1994 Convention

Marriott Rivercenter, San Antonio, Texas, January 8-12

Appendix D

Past Convention Sites

Convention	Year	City, Hotel
1st	1906	New York City (Murray Hill)
2nd	1907	New York City (Murray Hill)
3rd	1908	New York City (Murray Hill)
4th	1909	New York City (Murray Hill)
5th	1910	New York City (Astor)
6th	1911	New York City (Astor)
7th	1912	New York City (Astor)
8th	1913	New York City (Astor)
9th	1914	Chicago (LaSalle)
10th	1915	New York City (Astor)
11th	1916	New York City (Astor)
12th	1917	New York City (Astor)
13th	1918	New York City (Astor)
14th	1919	New York City (Astor)
15th	1920	Chicago (Sherman)
16th	1921	New York City (Astor)
17th	1922	New York City (Astor)
18th	1923	Atlanta (Georgian Terrace)
19th	1924	New York City (Astor)
20th	1925	New York City (Astor)
21st	1926	New York City (Astor)
22nd	1927	New York City (Astor)
23rd	1928	New Orleans (Roosevelt)
24th	1929 ⁺	New York City (Astor)
25th	1930	New York City (Astor)
26th	1931	New York City (Astor)
27th	1932	New York City (Astor)
28th	1933	Chicago (Stevens)
29th	1934	New York City (Pennsylvania)
30th	1935	New York City (Pennsylvania)
31st	1936	New York City (Pennsylvania)
32nd	1937	New Orleans (St. Charles)
33rd	1938	Chicago (Sherman)
34th	1939	Los Angeles (Biltmore)
35th	1940	New York City (New Yorker)
36th	1941	Detroit (Book-Cadillac)
37th	1942	New York City (Astor)
	1943	No meeting
38th	1944 ⁺	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (St. Francis)
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)

*Convened January 1, 1930.

†Officers, Executive Committee and chairs of rules committees only.

46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973	Chicago (Palmer House)
1st Special	1973	Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974	San Francisco (St. Francis)
69th	1975	Washington (Sheraton-Park)
2nd Special	1975	Chicago (Palmer House)
3rd Special	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
70th	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
71st	1977	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau)
72nd	1978	Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza)
73rd	1979	San Francisco (St. Francis)
74th	1980	New Orleans (Fairmont)
75th	1981	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau Hilton)
4th Special	1981	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront)
76th	1982	Houston (Hyatt Regency)
77th	1983	San Diego (Town and Country)
78th	1984	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
79th	1985	Nashville (Opryland)
5th Special	1985	New Orleans (Hyatt Regency)
80th	1986	New Orleans (Hilton Riverside)
81st	1987	San Diego (Town and Country)
6th Special	1987	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
82nd	1988	Nashville (Opryland)
83rd	1989	San Francisco (Hilton)
84th	1990	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
85th	1991	Nashville (Opryland)
86th	1992	Anaheim (Hilton and Towers)

Appendix E

NCAA Officers, 1906-1992

Years Name, Institution

President

1906-1913—Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1914-1916—LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
 1917-1929—Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1930-1932—Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
 1933-1937—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
 (Big Ten)
 1938-1940—William B. Owens, Stanford University
 1941-1944—Phillip O. Badger, New York University
 1945-1946—Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University,
 University of Wyoming
 1947-1949—Karl E. Lieb, University of Iowa
 1950-1952—Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
 1953-1954—Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
 1955-1956—Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
 1957-1958—Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
 1959-1960—Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College (Colorado)
 1961-1962—Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
 1963-1964—Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
 1965-1966—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1967-1968—Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
 1969-1970—Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
 1971-1972—Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 1973-1974—Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
 1975-1976—John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University
 1977-1978—J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas at Austin
 1979-1980—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1981-1982—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1983-1984—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1985-1986—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1987-1988—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1989-1990—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 1991-1992—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego

Secretary-Treasurer

1906-1908—Louis A. Bevier Jr., Rutgers University, New Brunswick
 1908—William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia
 (Treasurer only)
 1909-1939—Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
 1940-1944—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
 (Big Ten)
 1945-1951—Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1952-1954—Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
 1955-1956—Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
 1957-1958—Edwin D. Mouzon Jr., Southern Methodist University
 1959-1960—Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
 1961-1962—Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
 1963-1964—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1965-1966—Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines

1967-1968—Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
 1969-1970—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1971-1972—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, University of
 District of Columbia
 1973-1974—Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
 1975-1976—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
 1977-1978—Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College
 1979-1980—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1981-1982—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1983-1984—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1985-1986—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1987-1988—Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton
 1989-1990—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1991-1992—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University

Division I Vice-President

1983-1984—Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University
 1985—Arliss L. Roaden, Tennessee Technological University
 1986—Lewis A. Cryer, Pacific Coast Athletic Association
 1987-1988—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 1989-1990—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University
 1991—Douglas S. Hobbs, University of California, Los Angeles
 1992-1993—R. Elaine Dreidame, University of Dayton

Division II Vice-President

1983—Edwin W. Lawrence, University of Alaska Fairbanks
 1984-1985—Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University
 1986—Asa N. Green, Livingston University
 1987-1988—Howard Elwell, Gannon University
 1989-1990—Jerry M. Hughes, Central Missouri State University
 1991-1992—Anthony F. Ceddia, Shippensburg University of
 Pennsylvania

Division III Vice-President

1983—Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa)
 1984-1985—Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College
 1986-1987—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1988-1989—Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster
 1990-1991—Rocco J. Carzo, Tufts University
 1992-1993—John H. Harvey, Carnegie Mellon University

NATL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOC



1NCAA00002168J

NCAA®

NCAA 9259-4/93